

JPRS 77074

29 December 1980

China Report

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 152

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available from Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

29 December 1980

CHINA REPORT

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 152

CONTENTS

MILITARY AND PUBLIC SECURITY

Reforms Badly Needed in Militia Training (HEILONGJIANG RIBAO, 28 Sep, 17 Oct 80).....	1
Fewer 'Evaluations', by Shan Chengxiang and Zhang Jiming Better Training Programs by Wang Tsiping	

PARTY AND STATE

Geng Biao on Indochina Situation Prior to Sino-Vietnamese Conflict (CHUNG-KUNG YEN-CHIU, 15 Oct 80).....	3
Reforms Needed To Alter Widespread Bureaucratic Thinking (Zhao Shugan, DAZHONG RIBAO, 2 Oct 80)	18
Importance of Considering Everyone's Views Stressed (Lu Man; TIANJIN RIBAO, 12 Sep 80)	20
Practice Said Sole Criterion for Testing Truth (Ma Ming; ZHENGXUE YANJIU, Aug 80)	22
Column on Reeducation in Historical Materialism Launched (Wang Jiayang; ZHEJIANG RIBAO, 7 Oct 80)	28

SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Writers, Politicians Urged To Work for Modernization (Guo Fengqi, et al.; XINGANG, Mar 80).....	33
Kang Sheng's Role in Destruction of Education Reported (Zhang Xuexin; RENMIN JIAOYU, 20 Sep 80)	42

Proper Employment of Talented People Urged (RENMEN RIBAO, 15 Oct 80)	49
10-Point Proposal, by Zheng Yimin and Chen Gengsheng More Proposals	
Outrage Expressed at Seizure of Literary Magazine (Lian Zhengxiang; WENYI BAO, 12 Oct 80)	53
Relaxation of Control Over Literature, Art Urged (He Junying; RENMIN RIBAO, 8 Oct 80)	55

MILITARY AND PUBLIC SECURITY

REFORMS BADLY NEEDED IN MILITIA TRAINING

Fewer 'Evaluations'

Haerbin HEILONGJIANG RIBAO in Chinese 28 Sep 80 p 3

[Article by Shan Chengxiang [0830A 2052 4382] and Zhang Jiming [1728 4949 2494]:
"Reform Needed in Method of Evaluating Militia Training"]

[Text] When we visited several factories to inspect militia antiaircraft training we heard some comments on the method of evaluating militia training. After an investigation, we were appalled by what we discovered.

Taking the Dong An Machine Factory as an example, we learned that 624 members of the militia in that unit had been evaluated last year by the provincial, municipal, and district authorities no fewer than 21 times on antiaircraft practice, infantry marksmanship, handgrenade throwing, military tactics, and communications, etc. Although fewer evaluations have been conducted this year, members of the militia had been evaluated 10 times up to August.

The frequency of evaluating the training of the militia by the authorities in the past few years has had certain adverse effects on the work being done on the lower levels. It has not only reduced the productivity of the units concerned and the income of the participants, but it has also encouraged falsification and formalism. It has tied down members of the armed units and left them little time for the solution of problems on the grassroots level.

It is our opinion, first of all, that authorities at the various levels should change their style of work, that they should go deeply into the grassroots in helping grassroots units and militia companies to master basic military tactics and techniques under actual combat conditions, and that they should overcome their habit of sitting in the office thinking up plans and fanciful ideas and relying solely on evaluations as a means of gaining an understanding of the effectiveness of the training. Secondly, militia training should be evaluated by the responsible authorities at one certain level instead of by all the different levels. Evaluations should be undertaken where necessary and eliminated where not. In other words, the method of evaluation should be reformed. Aside from the antiaircraft and heavy artillery units which require the evaluation of higher authorities under a unified system, a uniform system of training and evaluation on the local level should be adopted to reduce the time spent on evaluations and the unnecessary waste of manpower and materials.

Better Training Programs

Haerbin HEILONGJIANG RIBAO in Chinese 17 Oct 80 p 3

[Article by Wang Tzuping [3769 1311 1627]: "Reforms Should Be Made in Militia Training"]

[Text] It is our understanding that the daily activities of not a few members of militia units are confined to the same old routine. Aside from group training, target practice and handgrenade throwing, few other courses are being offered. Even within the same old routine, there has been no change in training methods for a number of years. For this reason, some members of the militia have lost interest in the military exercises. This should furnish food for serious thought on the part of those who are engaged in work with the militia.

To keep pace with the continuing development of the four modernizations, there is need for major reform, not only with regard to organization but also in such areas as training policy, the training program, and methods used in militia training. If we are to continue to use established methods and to go round and round in a circle like an aged donkey turning a mill, we will fail to cope with the new developing situation.

What should we do? Nothing will suffice except to introduce reforms. In bringing about reforms, it is necessary to make a study of potential new developments in a future war so that we may come to know our own position as well as that of the enemy in order to ensure our victory. What new situations are likely to develop in a future war in the sky and on the ground, in our offense and in our defense, in the cities and in the villages? Those of us who are engaged in militia training must have in our minds a plan to cope with whatever situation may develop. Only thus can we come to realize what militia training should entail. Otherwise, we will be firing empty shells.

In bringing about reforms, it is also necessary for us to have an understanding of the thinking of the militia members. We should realize that the shifting of emphasis in the work of the party and the changes in many major policies have raised a number of questions that weigh on the minds of the militia members. Many of these questions are resolved satisfactorily, they will affect not only the personal welfare of members of the militia, but also their training program and their productivity. This is a problem that should not be ignored.

In introducing reforms, it is further necessary to take heed of the special characteristics of the militia. Our entire militia is comprised of young people. That means that in studying and formulating plans for their training and their activities, we must make sure that these plans are in tune with the characteristics of young people. Only then can we achieve the objectives of militia training and ensure the development of organized training and the productive potential of the militia.

In any case, reforms in militia training work cannot be avoided. Those of our comrades who are engaged in work with the militia should come to terms with realities and endeavor to raise our work with the militia to a new and higher level in this new era.

9621

CSO: 4005

PARTY AND STATE

GENG BIAO ON INDOCHINA SITUATION PRIOR TO SINO-VIETNAMESE CONFLICT

Taipei CHUNG-KUNG YEN-CHIU [STUDIES ON CHINESE COMMUNISM] in Chinese Vol 14 No 10, 15 Oct 80 pp 141-162

[Introducing a Document: "Chinese Communist Party Central Political Bureau Member Comrade Geng Biao's 'Report on the Situation in the Indochinese Peninsula,' 16 January 1979"]

[Text] Introducing a Document

"Report on the Situation in the Indochinese Peninsula" is an internal report given on 16 January 1979 by Geng Biao, "Chinese Communist Party [CCP] Central Political Bureau member, Chinese Communist Party Central Military Commission Secretary-General." The original text of the "Report" published in this journal here is the text originally transcribed from a recording cassette by the "International Liaison Department of the CCP Central Committee."

It has been almost 2 years since the "Report" was first given. During these 2 years, the Indochinese Peninsula and related international situation have both undergone new changes; but this does not affect the important referential value of this "Report" as a document to the study of Communist China and related questions.

As can be seen from its content, Geng Biao's "Report" was closely related to the Sino-Vietnamese border war that occurred in February 1979. This war was another important border war involving the use of large military forces since the mid-1950's and more than 10 years since Communist China concluded its border with India. The year 1979 was a time of continued escalation of the internal political power struggles of the Chinese Communist Party after the death of Mao Zedong and the collapse of the "gang of four," a time when the internal situation of the Chinese Communist Party was facing disintegration and ramification and when all troubles seemed to have broken loose. Why did the Chinese Communists carry out a border war involving large military forces and great costs against "socialist" Vietnam at this time? What was the Chinese Communists' estimation of the international situation, especially the Indo-chinese situation, at the time? And what were the task and goal of the Chinese Communist war against Vietnam, and the policy

arrangements in the domestic and external aspects?... There are fairly reliable (because they come from internal report) data revealing all of these to us in Geng Biao's "Report." Therefore, even though this "Report" has already become dated by two years, it still bears multiple, useful referential value to our study of the on-going development of the Indochinese situation, the present conditions of the relationship between the Chinese Communists and the Vietnamese Communists, between Communist China and Indochina and "the world of the two superpowers," and their application, and questions of the like. This is one of the main reasons why this journal decides to have it published here.

—CHUNG-KUNG YEN-CHIU Editorial Department

Secret

Member of the Political Bureau, CCP Central Committee Comrade Geng Biao's "Report on the Situation in the Indochinese Peninsula,"

16 January 1979

Transcription from Recording Cassette by the International Liaison Department of the CCP Central Committee, printed on 21 January 1979

Comrades:

Phnom Penh fell; Sihanouk and Ieng Sary have arrived in Beijing in succession. The former liaison office of the Kampuchea Unity Government is now again vacated. All this is going to bring to our comrades many problems. Because the situation has changed very rapidly, Chairman Hua, in order to let the Party Central, the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress, the State Council, the Central Military Commission and leading cadres and comrades of their various departments at various levels have a clear understanding, has especially permitted me to represent the Party Central and make a brief report to our comrades on the situation in the Indochinese Peninsula and also to explain preliminarily the Party Central Committee's estimation of the situation and attendant principles and policies in preparation to solve it from now on, so as to avoid the forthcoming possibility of inconsistency and resultant difficulties among us.

My speech today is not going to be issued as the Party Central's formal document to the subordinate departments and units; on a part of its contents, we must do a good job of protecting its secrecy. Apart from communication at concerned departments and units, comrades may also make a summary record of its main spirit and major points. As to how to communicate and communicate to what extent, you will be notified separately.

Up to today, except the two or three provinces which are still being defended by the Government of Democratic Kampuchea, Party and Government organs are making orderly retreat. Vietnamese troops have already reached the Thai border; within less than 10 days, Vietnamese troops may occupy Kampuchea entirely. From the very beginning, Vietnam sent three columns, and then five columns, to march respectively but all converge on Phnom Penh and finally occupy it; now, it has further diverted a part of

these troops to form a flank along Route No 5 to coordinate with another contingent advancing along Route No 6 toward Kompong Thom, and continue to press forward the attack toward Pursat, Battambang, and Siem Reap. In order to retard the enemy troops' speed of advance and cover the retreat, the Kampuchean Revolutionary Army has organized a defense line between Kompong and Bang-ko-tai [transliteration] and a second defense line at Siem Reap so as to effectively retard the enemy troops and win some more time. In most of the other areas, active retreat is being undertaken under the condition of offering no defense in order to move to more advantageous terrains. But because the troops of Vietnam have advanced along highway No 6 at a far greater speed than expected and threaten to skirt around to Battambang at any time, the morale of the [Kampuchean] troops became seriously affected, and the defense lines collapsed all of a sudden; more than 7,000 Kampuchean soldiers were killed at different times or captured. Even Comrade Sung Cheng nearly failed to pull out. Later on, Comrade Sung Cheng personally organized the defending battle at Battambang; within 36 hours he organized more than 20 counter charges and succeeded in exterminating completely the 18 tanks and one battalion spearheading the enemy attack. This served at least to win some time, let the Party Central convene an urgent meeting, and stabilize the situation to accomplish the retreat. After completing their shifting operations, Kampuchean forces entered the Dangrek in two contingents to set up base there; another contingent marched northward to guard the rear so as to let the troops and Government personnel concentrated in the area adjoining Battambang and Siem Reap retreat to the Oddar Meanchey base. Before the fall of Sisophon on 13 January, the Kampuchean Government and troops had already completed their strategic retreat, successfully preserving half of the Government organs and resources and two-thirds of the troops. These vital forces will be the capital for counter-attack in the future, and are also the basis for us to declare Democratic Kampuchea to be the only legitimate government today.

Vietnam will discover that what they have gained today is not victory but the beginning of defeat. I would say that Vo Nguyen Giap has become senile, and the head of Van Tien Dung is turning in a whirl, so that even today they still cannot tell whether Kampuchean troops are retreating in defeat or carrying out a strategic shift. From the Vietnamese documents captured at Battambang, it is possible to see that the headquarters of their invading forces is now being really troubled by its inability to find the principal force of the Kampuchean Army. According to intelligence report, the whole invading Vietnamese force includes 14 divisions and 9 mechanized armed units, plus the original Kampuchean rebel forces and one division and two artillery battalions from Laos; these units are now all bogged down, whereas the heroic Kampuchean Revolutionary Army proceeds to launch an action of vehement counter-attack. Life for Vietnam and the puppet National Salvation Front regime simultaneously propped up is not going to be comfortable in the days to come. Why Vietnam did not direct its forces to carry out the invasion last year when Kampuchean-Vietnamese relations were interrupted, but drag until today before getting the action started? The fact is that even before South Vietnam was liberated, Vietnam already harbored a sinister plot; its handful of war fanatics, under the behind-the-scene instigation of their back-stage boss, social imperialism, had already thought of putting a finger in Kampuchea's pie by dragging the latter into the so-called "Indochinese Federation" so as to make it the jumping board and advance base for the social imperialism to realize its worldwide strategic plan and to expand toward the Southeast Asian region. But under the condition of large-scale intervention by American forces in the Vietnam war at the time, South and North Vietnam were hard put in coping with that war and hence had no surplus energy to divert to the question of Kampuchea. Meanwhile, when

Prince Sihanouk was in power, and pursuant to his rejection of American aid in March 1964 and severance of relations with the United States in May 1965, the country's political inclination was still to support and sympathize with Vietnam and to allow North Vietnam to pass through the country in order to transport to South Vietnam the supplies of materials and personnel consigned to the southern liberation movement. Therefore, Prince Sihanouk had granted favors to Vietnam, and Vietnam was in his debt. Yet, the country now is confronted with a return of enmity for its favors, in contrast to his practice of virtue in the face of animosity; perhaps we should say that Sihanouk has made a similar mistake like we did in giving Vietnam too much, so that we are both suffering such a consequence today. To begin with, if the United States did not instigate Lon Nol, Sirimata, to take advantage of Sihanouk's trip abroad to stage a coup and overthrow the monarchical government, the situation would not have been like this today. The Nixon Government of the United States is indirectly responsible for the fact that Kampuchea finds itself in such a situation today. When the coup succeeded and Kampuchea became another kind of state, this Vietnam war very naturally expanded into an Indochina war at large. At this juncture, Vietnam's support for the liberation war led by the Kampuchean National Unity Government was imperative. The reason was very simple: without the support of Kampuchea's Sihanouk Government, Vietnam would have disappeared long ago. Another important reason was that they both could not do without China's aid. In helping Kampuchea at the time, Vietnam was like "Xiang Zhuang [7309 5445] who put up a sword dance with Pei Gong [3099 0361] in his mind," i.e., as it sought on the pretext of carrying out its internationalist duty to bring its expansionist and hegemonist thinking into this just war. At that time, we also sensed that this kind of involving relations was hard to accommodate, and winding up this involvement would be difficult. From what Le Duc Tho said to Premier Penn Nouth of the Kampuchean National Unity Government in Beijing at the end of April 1972, a discerning person would immediately detect something ominous, as he said: "we can drive out Lon Nol for Kampuchea." At the time Penn Nouth replied: "we have nothing; how are we going to return Vietnam's selfless assistance in the future?" Le Duc Tho glaringly said: "it does not matter; what we give you we can also take back by that time." As early as 1971, Chairman Mao had already told Prince Sihanouk: "We must solve our own problems by ourselves; we must have confidence in ourselves. We may accept foreign aid, but cannot depend on it." In 1973, Chairman Mao also told Sihanouk about the fact that Ho Chi Minh once also mentioned to Chairman Mao his intention to set up an "Indochinese Federation," so he asked the Kampuchean leadership not to lose vigilance. After 1974, Vietnam took the opportunity of coordinating with the Kampuchean Liberation Army in carrying out fighting in Kampuchea to foster pro-Vietnam elements in the country, thus sowing the seeds of misfortune. On 15 August 1975, Khieu Samphan came to China; he also discussed in detail this potential problem. Upon the liberation of Phnom Penh in May 1975, at first the Vietnamese troops made some excuses not to leave the country; but because South and North Vietnam were still not unified at that time, and the faction opposed to unification was still very powerful; China, in the meantime, repeatedly applied pressure and supported the new government in Kampuchea, so that Vietnam, while dragging its feet, finally took half a year to complete the withdrawal of its troops. On the other hand, there were too many factions in the military ranks of Kampuchea; at that time, there were already three such factions. One was under the direct control of Pol Pot, Khieu Samphan, and others consisting mainly of Kampuchean workers and peasants; it was the majority faction in the military ranks and also the principal force. Another was a faction of the original royal troops loyal to Sihanouk and the old patriotic officers and soldiers who bolted Lon Nol units to join the liberation war; this part of people was not very numerous, but they were all well trained, all allies of the Communists, and also sympathizers of the

revolution. The third was no other than the pro-Vietnam faction, which had not a few members, nor very bad equipment. If these three factions were properly handled when the Kampuchean Army began to consolidate its ranks in 1976, the situation could have been better. But the Kampuchean Communist Party did not follow the correct approach in handling them, thus leading to an expansion of mutual contradictions. In the first place, they failed to treat Sihanouk well, this made the old soldiers recalcitrant; nor did they evince the correct attitude in treating these soldiers, as they did not proceed to transform this contingent of old soldiers with rich fighting experience like we did to the troops of Wu Huawen [0704 0553 2429], Dong Qiwu [5516 0366 2976], and others. In certain districts, they did especially badly, as they even treated them and their families as reactionary troops and reactionary families, who were subject to either persecution, or the fate of disbandment and disarmament. This way of doing things inadvertently forced a part of the forces previously in support of the Communist Party to revolt and turn around to merge with those remnant units of Lon Nol who had become bandits in the hills and change into counterrevolutionary armed guerrillas. In handling the pro-Vietnam faction, the commanding officers also failed to make a distinction between the question of stand and the question of ideology, grabbing all at once more than 4,000 of them, who were either put to death or imprisoned; thus everybody felt threatened and ultimately ended up in open revolt. This greatly affected the morale and inclination of those units that were originally loyal to the party.

Strictly speaking, discipline of the Kampuchean Army had been rather lax; stirring up trouble along the Kampuchean border was representative of the blind actions of the units and of their anarchism. In February last year, the Kampuchean forces sought to enforce disciplinary rectification; this was a correct approach. When Song Cheng came to China later, he also indicated that after the disciplinary rectification campaign was completed, Kampuchea would have sufficient confidence to completely eliminate all the pro-Vietnam forces within 6 or 7 months. We believed him and also provided necessary assistance. Little did we imagine that this was not to be the case. These units, which were not good enough to help bring about success, felt compelled by some mere, slight excuses to pull into the hills right away and start their guerrilla activities; this also made our plan and effort to re-establish the Sihanouk regime completely fruitless. At first, contact was also made with the United States on this plan, and they also nodded, indicating that so long as the peaceful situation in Southeast Asia could be maintained to contain the social-imperialist forces of expansion, the Americans would be working even harder than we. So long as we can see this clearly, we need not worry about the Americans not intervening. But now, isn't everything dandy! Phnom Penh is evacuated 7 months earlier; we can only support Sihanouk's accusations at the United Nations in conjunction with the United States, Japan, Britain, France, and members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, and try to force Vietnam to withdraw its forces. In reality, however, we have calculated for sure that Vietnam is not going to withdraw its forces; in doing so, we aim merely at winning some more time to re-deploy and wait until the raining season comes before doing anything else.

Vietnam signed a treaty of alliance with the Soviet Union in November; thus the Soviet Union stepped forward from behind the scene to bind Vietnam tightly onto its war chariot and at the same time also back Vietnam up with the same treaty of alliance and hence help aggravate Vietnam's cockiness. Vietnam did the right thing in joining the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, and thereby gaining a great deal of aid from the Soviet Union; but none of what the Soviet Union could give it could not be enjoyed as food, clothing, or daily amenities. We have had the experience of being

short-changed by this "big brother"; how can we fail to know what they sent to Vietnam? The Soviet Union transferred to Vietnam the kind of equipment which cannot be considered very advanced at a price higher than that in the international market; can this type of aid be still called selfless? Perhaps only Heaven knows! Since the Soviet Union sold petroleum to Vietnam at US\$13 a barrel, we can most certainly sell it to Kampuchea at US\$5 a barrel to test its avaricious appetite and see how it is able to bear it. We can say this: we have been too generous in the past. After losing our large amount of aid and trade exchange with us, Vietnam will lack still more foodgrain and basic daily necessities. In addition, a flood disaster last year caused a loss of 4 million tons of foodgrain harvest; this has further aggravated the country's economic difficulties and accelerated the contradictions between the South and the North. In order to divert the people of Vietnam from the material shortage which has resulted because the present regime leaned to one side and economically depended entirely on the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, and from the increasingly sharpening contradictions aroused by the Labor Party's forcible enforcement of its production and distribution plans and policies in the new economic zones and by the unreasonable distribution and deployment of power and construction plans and arrangements between the South and the North, the Vietnam Labor Party began, on the one hand, to persecute a large number of southern cadres from September 1977 onwards, passing the so-called "Resolution of the Labor Party Central on Work After the Unification of the South and the North" to exclude, attack, and cruelly struggle against those with different opinions and views and those who had feelings of dissatisfaction toward Vietnam's southern economic policies; on the other hand, it was forced to intensify the engineering of Kampuchean-Vietnamese border conflicts, thus ultimately encroaching upon Kampuchea to divert the people's sight and to mollify the various increasingly sharpening contradictions by the act of aggression. This was also a major reason for invading Kampuchea. Another reason was that the Soviet Union and Vietnam have seen how China and Japan signed the Treaty of Peace and Friendship, how Vice Chairman Deng, after visiting members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, also visited Japan; in addition, the success of Chairman Hua's visits to Romania and Yugoslavia both directly and indirectly rendered a great blow against social imperialism; such frequent diplomatic activities served to greatly raise China's international prestige and win the sympathy and support of even more countries; in thus reaching mutual understanding, the Western countries have concluded huge trade agreements, scientific and technological cooperation, and even technical exchange and trade on atomic energy, space and electronics; in the military field, similarly, the developed countries of the West are helping us with great interest to work on the modernization of our national defense, and hence upsetting the plot of social imperialism to vainly attempt to isolate, attack, contain and strangle China. Today, we are shifting the focus of our work to economic construction; the four modernizations are being carried out with increasing speed. A powerful China, just like a rising sun, is looming above the horizon with full vigor. But social imperialism is most afraid of the appearance of such a situation; therefore they are bound to play all sorts of tricks in order to interfere and sabotage it. The expelling of Chinese from Vietnam and the invading of Kampuchea, plus the engineering of bloody incidents along the Sino-Vietnamese border, the intention lies also here. On 16 December last year, in particular, China and the United States declared their readiness to establish diplomatic relations on 1 January this year; just this resulted not only in the writing of a new chapter in the history of Sino-American relations but also entirely changed the ratio of the world's forces. Vietnam abandoned all preconditions in an attempt to establish diplomatic relations with the United States, but the U.S. Government paid no attention; instead, it was a China still with the Taiwan problem on hand that first

established such relations with the United States. This was a great sarcasm. Therefore, the establishment of Sino-American relations hit the body of the Soviet Union but hurt the heart of Vietnam. These two brothers could not help turning a feeling of shame into anger; in order to save their face, they could only try out their sword on Kampuchea. Thus occurred the Kampuchean incident. Later, when Le Duan mentioned the situation about his talks with Pol Pot in Phnom Penh, we also frankly pointed out that the Vietnam Labor Party lacked the spirit of treating a brotherly party equally; Pol Pot merely disagreed with the Vietnam Labor Party's thinking about establishing an Indochinese Federation, and there was absolutely no question of opposition to Vietnam. Also, the talks this time were somewhat different in spirit from 1975 when Pol Pot went to Hanoi to participate in the Kampuchean-Vietnamese talks then. At that time, Le Duan himself also indicated that it was still premature then to talk about establishing an Indochinese Federation; the Vietnam Labor Party meant merely to exchange opinion with the Kampuchean Communist Party on the future development of the three Indochinese states, and had no intention of imposing its own opinion upon a brotherly party. Since this was the case, apart from the fact that the demarcation of boundaries between Vietnam and Kampuchea still remained to be solved, no great contradictions actually existed any longer. Since today Le Duan chooses to accuse us in reverse of supporting Kampuchea to oppose Vietnam, we are forced to issue a refutation to such an "improvised" accusation, and at the same time indicate our own attitude:

- (1) On the basis of the principle of fraternal relations between our parties, we would absolutely not allow any approach designed by political party to encroach upon the independence of another Communist Party or interfere with the internal affairs of another fraternal party.
- (2) We support the Kampuchean Communist Party headed by Pol Pot and the Democratic Kampuchean Government under its leadership.
- (3) We oppose any forcible approach to compelling Kampuchea to join any federation of the three Indochinese states.
- (4) The Vietnam Workers Party must solve its contradictions with Kampuchea with an egalitarian and sincere attitude.

By the time of the talks between the Chinese and Vietnamese Parties in November 1977, differences between Vietnam and Kampuchea were no longer concealable. Our painstaking intention to endeavor to avoid making such contradictions public since Kampuchea's liberation in 1975 thus finally failed. Therefore, in December the Party Central Committee decided to assist Kampuchea in force so as to equip them with a greater capability to cope with new situations that could occur because a solution through talks proved impossible; we made efforts all around, falling only short of sending troops. When Comrade Wang Dongxing went to visit, the Kampuchean Government actually made such a request; Comrade Su Zhenhua [5685 2182 5478] also made the suggestion to dispatch a detachment of the East China Fleet to Kampuchea to help Kampuchea guard its territorial waters well, or even just to send a fleet there for a visit. Comrade Xu Shiyu also said to let him take some units to Guangxi to manage for a while. But, after prolonged deliberations, the Party Central Committee rejected both Comrade Su Zhenhua's suggestion and disagreed with Comrade Xu Shiyu's opinion, and in the end sent no single soldier. Why?

(1) We are a socialist state; we have never sent any troops, planes, or war vessels to other countries, and we also oppose any other state for doing so. Even though we agree today that the United States should retain certain armed forces in the Asian-Pacific region, we are merely indicating our understanding about the stationing of American troops in Japan, the Philippines, and places of the like; this is absolutely not the same as supporting the long-range stationing of foreign troops in foreign territories, or the establishment of military bases. Our comrades must never think that, since our relations with the United States are now normalized, we can henceforth forget the imperialist and hegemonist essence of the United States. We are very different from the United States. If we should send troops to Kampuchea, not only would we have broken this principle, but what impression would this convey to the countries of Southeast Asia and other countries of the world? Not only the anti-hegemonist united front in unity with the Third World cannot be established, we would also have become a new hegemonist power; there would be no end once this erroneous step is taken.

(2) In the case of most countries of the world today, whether they like the regime led by Pol Pot or not, they still insist on recognizing Democratic Kampuchea and blaming Vietnam for its aggression as well as supporting China's just stand; this is precisely because, very obviously, only Vietnam has troops in Kampuchea. If we had also sent troops there, the situation would have been very different. In the least, Comrade Chen Chu would not have been able to speak in his usual forthright manner at the United Nations; and if there should be the slightest mishandling, he might even have to stand in a defendant's stead. Hence, to be unable to hold one's ground in the international arena is one thing, but, more seriously, Vietnam and its puppets would be able to relish on taking this as a pretext and launch their vicious attack on us in reverse, alleging that we are interfering with the internal affairs of other countries and thereby turning its previous war of aggression around. By that time, it would not be easy even if we wished to extend assistance in force. See what a fine situation it remains today! If we choose to extend whatever assistance we please, we are supporting a just struggle against aggression; this good point is clearly on our side.

(3) In the context of Indochina's geographical environment and various political, economic and ideological backgrounds, plus many other complicated factors, it is impossible to adopt a blitzkrieg in Hitler's style in trying to solve the general situation. The Americans have had a taste of the consequence in this regard; it is possible that their understanding is more profound. To fight a war in Indochina is a laborious but fruitless thing. Vietnam has already stepped into this patch of mud; it is bound to be dragged to collapse. Should we send troops, we would be dragged down too, and it would be very difficult to tell what the final outcome might be. We ourselves already lack sufficient strength to fight such a war of exhaustion, unless we no longer wanted the four modernizations, or if we had the kind of economic conditions and productive power like the United States and Japan. To us, not sending troops today puts us in an advantageous position from whatever angle, and this constitutes also a training for the Kampuchean Communist Party. Our all-out assistance, plus Kampuchea's confidence, determination, and daring and dexterous struggle, would spell nothing but bad luck for Vietnam and the Soviet Union.

(4) If you think that just because Vietnam knew we would not send any troops so it ventured to invade Kampuchea without fear, this is not entirely correct either. Its back-stage boss, the Soviet Union, most certainly hoped that we would send troops

because, to Vietnam, under such circumstances, the place to suffer war devastation would be Kampuchea and not Vietnam, and to the Soviet Union, once you in China should get involved, we in the Soviet Union can both blame you in international public opinion and openly support Vietnam to fight to the end. Vietnam, on its part, also figured that once you get involved, we would also be no longer subject to restriction and seek assistance from both the left and the right, and domestically, too, there would be a pretext for mobilizing more forces to join the war effort. Thus both Vietnam and the Soviet Union have long figured things out: in the short run, they would make it impossible for you to carry out your four modernizations; in the long run, if you Chinese troops should enter into direct conflict with Vietnam and the fire of war thus spread to Vietnam itself, then on the basis of the Soviet-Vietnamese treaty the Soviet Union would have reason to despatch troops from the north to conduct a pincer attack; by that time, even the United States, West Europe and Japan would find it difficult to say whether they were the aggressor or you were the aggressor. Kampuchea is only a small country; its area is but the size of Hubei Province and its population is less than that of Beijing. But the things happening here are so complex, with one easily affecting all of the rest; we must be very careful. If we should once start to fight a big battle with the Soviet Union, the populace would be greatly pleased; but, by that time, what hope is still there for the investments, loans, and assistance to our four modernizations from the United States, Europe, and Japan? This is not a question of whether or not we are afraid, but a question of considering the beneficial or ill consequences. On this question, we can conclude with three points: one, we will not send any troops; two, we will not stop our assistance; and three, we will support [Kampuchea] to the very end.

Although we cannot directly send troops to Kampuchea in support of their war effort, we cannot deny that we still have not a few personnel working Kampuchea today; apart from construction work, a part of them is also helping Kampuchea fight the war. This contingent of personnel numbers about 1,500. When the war situation became urgent in December last year, our Foreign Ministry already notified Ambassador Sun Hao [1327 3185] to ask all the personnel assisting Kampuchea to retreat in separate batches; thus we did not prepare to participate in the fighting. But the situation changed too precipitously; many failed to retreat in time, and they still remain in Kampuchea today. Now they all willingly give up their Chinese citizenship to take on Kampuchean citizenship, and therefore refuse to accept the directive of China's Foreign Ministry to retreat and volunteer to join the struggle against Vietnam and for national salvation. We have no way of stopping them from doing so; nor can this be termed an exportation of revolution. Our principle on this matter is not to encourage, but nor to oppose or stop them; when Kampuchea becomes liberated for the second time, they will still be the sons and daughters of the Kampuchean people and their ~~harmesq~~ who are our relatives but not Chinese. In doing so, they have provided the equivalent of a powerful explanation as to the Vietnamese regime's attempt to confuse right and wrong and turn things upside down by slandering, passing on the rumor and accusation that there are Chinese personnel participating in the fighting.

We already gave permission for representative delegations and groups of the governmental organs of Democratic Kampuchea and their party to set up a temporary government office in Beijing; they are also actively asking Thailand to allow them to set up such an office inside Thai territory or at the border; on this matter Vice Premier Ieng Sary has already put forward a formal request to Premier Kriangsak. Last time, our Vice Chairman Deng also made the following requests to Vice Premier Sunthon Hongladarom of Thailand:

(1) Carry out more effective cooperation with China in order to resist the expansionist forces of the Soviet Union and Vietnam and safeguard the peace and stability of the Southeast Asian region and Asian-Pacific region.

(2) Continue to support the Government of Democratic Kampuchea, recognize its legitimate status, and, on this premise, reject the request of the present puppet regime to take over the country's diplomatic establishment in Thailand and allow [the Government of Democratic Kampuchea] to set up an office at the Thai border, whether public, semi-public, or not public at all.

(3) Continue to provide political asylum to the persecuted Party, political and military personnel and people of the Government of Democratic Kampuchea, and also grant them the right to enter Thai territory and proceed further to China or other areas.

At the same time, Vice Chairman Deng also asked Vice Premier Sunthon to relate to Premier Kriangsak and the Thai Government that the Chinese Government wished the Thai Government would allow the passage of aid materiel to be transported to Kampuchea through Thailand. The fact that the Thai Government still evinces a non-committal attitude on this matter show that it faces its own dilemma, and not wishing to run into direct conflict with Vietnam is the main reason; we can well understand.

However, we must lay bare the facts. We told Sunthon that the relationship between Kampuchea and Thailand, or between Kampuchea and Southeast Asia, is like that between the lips and the teeth; it is impossible to try to keep oneself out of it. We believe Thailand can appreciate this principle from the following three aspects:

(1) To Thailand at present, the greatest threat comes not from Kampuchea but from Vietnam; even if Democratic Kampuchea were not subject to Vietnamese aggression this time, the manpower and material resources of that country still cannot compare to those of Thailand. I remember that when Vice Chairman Deng visited Thailand, he already explained to Premier Kriangsak that Kampuchea had no intention of resorting to expansion but wished only to improve relations between the two countries; on this, China would be in a position to guarantee. In the past, bloody conflicts often occurred along the Kampuchean border; this could only be said to be due to the lax discipline of the Kampuchean troops. For over a year now, the disciplinary rectification work on the part of these troops has been too slow; these conflicts resulted only from problems of hilltop tendencies and blind actions within the Kampuchean units, and they by no means constituted any threat to Thailand.

(2) Thailand understands that Vietnam's next target is no other than Thailand. If Thailand is intelligent enough, it should go all out to support the Government of Democratic Kampuchea to launch guerrilla warfare; not to mention allowing China's aid materiel pass through Thailand, it should itself round up other members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, or even the United States and Japan, to carry out the support together. After doing so, Kampuchea's strength for resistance becomes augmented and succeeds in stemming Vietnam's expansionist forces off its door, so that the Kampuchean Revolutionary Army would be guarding Thailand's gate against the enemy: why is this not just fine?

(3) So long as the resistance movement in Kampuchea perseveres for one day, Vietnam would be detained one day, and the time for the realization of an "Indochinese Federation" and the perpetration of a direct threat to Southeast Asia would also be delayed one day. The longer Vietnam is detained, the more its internal forces would become

exhausted, and the more sufficient time would also be won, so that the revolutionary forces inside Vietnam would also grow stronger, and ultimately, like Lenin said, "turn an imperialist war into a civil war," and thereby cause the collapse of the reactionary ruling clique of Vietnam from within. Thus, war causes revolution, and revolution in turn stops war: the possibility for such an outcome is very great. Thailand has the responsibility to create such conditions, and that would also be the best policy for safeguarding Thailand's own security.

At a time like this, the Thai Communist Party really demonstrated an appropriate internationalist spirit. Although its strength is limited, it resolutely dispatched several military units to traverse the long road southward to the Thai-Laotian-Kampuchean border to help in the fighting. In order to avoid running into direct conflict with the Thai military units, some even crossed the area of several hundred li through Laos to help reinforce Kampuchea's force-shifting work. The underground comrades of the Thai Communist Party even risked their lives in doing their best to help Democratic Kampuchea, as they did a good job in carrying out intelligence work in the rear of the enemy. Only in hardship is true affection shown; the performance of the Thai Communists is indeed very moving. In the meantime, seven central responsible comrades and working cadres of the Thai Communist Party Central Committee also organized a delegation; they have already arrived at the Chinese border on the 12th on their way to Kunming, and will reach Beijing in a few days. The main purpose of this delegation is to study with us and the Kampuchean Communist Party the Indochinese situation and define the direction and plans of struggle from now on as well as the details of our aid to them.

Previously, according to our aid-Kampuchea plan, we were going to provide before December last year equipment for three divisions and enough food, medicine and ammunitions for 100,000 troops, and also to guarantee the maintenance of the basic figure of 15 bullets per man for the first line of troops. But we do not share a common border with Kampuchea, and are separated by Vietnam and Laos; in order to provide a large amount of assistance, therefore, even though the sea route can still be used, it is estimated that shortly after the fall of Kampuchea, Soviet and Vietnamese submarines will appear in Kampuchea's territorial sea; if under such circumstances we should use the sea route opposite the converging point of the Thai-Kampuchean borders to enter Kampuchea, we would be committing the error of making ourselves conspicuous targets.

Even if we are not stopped on the sea, our regularity in using such an approach may become easily detected and we would hence be cut off on land later. Although it is difficult to render aid through both sea and land routes, there are still other ways; at least the American naval forces in this region can give some minor assistance, such as watching the Soviet vessels while at the same time communicating with us and telling us the Vietnamese vessels' direction of movement. When Vice Chairman Deng visits the United States at the end of this month, he is going to make this special suggestion to Carter: if the United States can actively participate, that would be most ideal; but even help under cover will still do. Furthermore, the United States has requested that we open up the Shanghai harbor for the 7th fleet to anchor there; as we look at the matter now, will it be more helpful to the stable situation in Southeast Asia if we opened up the Yulin harbor instead? The function of keeping a watch on the Cam Ranh Bay should be at least not amiss. As for Thailand, so long as they can keep an eye open and an eye closed, that would do; let them spar with Vietnam when necessary, there should be no problem here.

Apart from all this, we would have to rely on the north-south land route to extend our aid. In the Vietnam war in the past, there was the Ho Chi Minh Trail which passed through Kampuchea; now we might as well also do a little research and work out some kind of trail to pass through Burma and Thailand. This will mainly depend on the Thai Communists; without them, it will not do. Although from one end to the other, this route stretches some 1,000 kilometers, and there would be difficulties to put through large quantities of aid, at least there won't be any problem in sending through convoys of Sino-Kampuchean personnel, setting up communications depots and liaison lines in the future. The reason the Thai Communist Party despatched a delegation here secretly this time is of course not just to talk about this matter; the Thai Communist Party mainly intends to connect the northern and southern forces together, and take this opportunity to put up an earth-shaking struggle. But the Thai Communist Party itself is subject to powerful pressure from the Vietnamese Communists, and the revisionist elements within its own ranks are also making some moves in an attempt to engage in sectarian and splittist activities. It is therefore forced to come to China, so as we can all sit down and discuss a little; these problems should be soluble. In my own personal opinion, in our effort to help Kampuchea from now on, the Thai Communists, on their part, will play an important role. Therefore, we are trying presently to persuade them, to have them realize that, in the face of a powerful enemy, they should be able to adopt a consistent stand with the Thai Government on the question of coping with Vietnamese hegemonism. We are not, of course, asking them to lay down their arms and go before the Government building in Bangkok to register; but they may well seek to reduce their tendency of running into frontal conflict with the Thai Government to the minimum. In doing so, we can help the Thai Communist Party to preserve its substantive strength on the one hand, and encourage Kriangsak to make up his mind to cooperate with us in helping Kampuchea. If we can round up ASEAN from this, things will be even easier. If we further secure the support of the United States, Japan, Britain and France, Kampuchea's future will become even inestimable. Even if Premier Kriangsak does not agree, it will not matter very much; at least the Thai Communists will be supporting us; it will not be possible for us to let Thailand keep itself intact like a wise man. The situation before us is self-evident: it is impossible for Thailand to stay away from the region's affairs. If you take out a map and look at it, you will immediately know that it would be most convenient for us to go through the territory of Laos in order to open up supplemental transportation routes on land in our effort to aid Kampuchea; the guerrillas in Laos can be just put to the right kind of use in this connection. We need not dwell on this point any further; you will naturally understand.

In the hilly areas of Thailand, Burma and Laos, there is still another force which is most useful, even more useful than the Thai Communists; this is namely the force of the Kuomintang. You should not belittle the contingents the Kuomintang has deployed along these areas; the Burmese Government troops have attempted several times to move them, but each time they ended up with losses plus apology. Nor dared the armed units of the Burmese Communist Party and the Thai Communist Party to touch them. As we figure it, almost 30 years have elapsed; except those two occasions when we exercised our international influence and succeeded in forcing a part of them to be sent back to Taiwan, their basic strength has never been weakened; even today, the Burmese and the Thai Government still adopt a tolerant attitude toward them. The Kuomintang troops' fighting power is not bad; they concentrate on swiping at our enemies. If we can convert this force to help us swipe at the rear of Vietnam, the contribution will far exceed what the batch of pitiful little fellows of the Thai Communist Party can bring about for us.

The estimate of the present international situation by the Third Plenum of the 11th Party Central Committee is entirely correct. At present, nothing is more important than the rapid establishment in the international arena an international united front centered on opposition to Soviet socialist imperialism. Whether or not we can stop the expansion of the social-imperialist aggressive forces, whether or not we can turn the revolutionary parties of the world back to the correct Marxist-Leninist road and get them united, whether or not we can get the international Communist movement to step on a new journey, whether or not we can help all the enslaved peoples and oppressed nations rid themselves of the shackles binding them, and effectively prevent a new world war from breaking out ahead of time all depend on whether or not we mobilize and organize the people who make up more than 95 percent of the world's population into a vast revolutionary army in opposition to social imperialism. We must unite all forces that can be united in order to isolate and encircle social imperialism, the Soviet Union, and to deter it from taking a single step beyond its prescribed boundary. We have already successfully won the United States over and prevented the under-the-counter bargaining between the United States and the Soviet Union in the two hegemony's preparedness to partition the world. Today, a united front which includes the First World's secondary enemy, U.S. imperialism, and most countries of the Second World and the Third World in opposition to the social-imperialist hegemony is already forged. Today, isolated is no longer China but the trembling new Tsar. At the end of this month, when Vice Chairman Deng goes to the United States to visit, he will more or less work out some clear outline as to the questions how to jointly resist the expansion of forces of the Soviet Union in various parts of the world and how to prevent the Cuba of the East from swashbuckling across the Indo-chinese Peninsula at random. If there are no great difficulties, and the guerilla fighting in Kampuchea can last until 1981, the situation can then be completely reversed. Our tasks at present are very heavy; not only in the diplomatic arena openly we must exercise our influential power to make through various means countries of the world refuse to recognize the puppet regime supported by Vietnam, but must also intensify our support of the Government of the Revolutionary Army inside Kampuchean territory in order to prevent it from collapse before the appearance of that fine situation. Chairman Hua and Vice Chairman Deng have both represented our party and government to declare to the world our wish to support the resistance effort of the Government of Democratic Kampuchea to the very end; all of us must do a good job in this within the jurisdiction of our respective responsibilities.

As the last point, I would like to talk about our work and tasks from now on. We must unswervingly continue to support the Government of Democratic Kampuchea. This is not only our unshirkable internationalist duty, but also [a task] designed to safeguard peace and stability of our world. If, in the face of diverse challenges of hegemonism, we refrain from delivering powerful counter-blows, we would only boost the cockiness of the rear end. No matter how the Kampuchean Communist Party and the Government of Democratic Kampuchea have in the past accommodated this and that kind of shortcomings and mistakes, as a sovereign state it must not allow any regime to take that as a pretext to carry out intervention, subversion, and aggression. The Kampuchean Communist Party is our brotherly party; the people of Kampuchea are friends of the Chinese people. Their struggle is our struggle; their victory is our victory. Just as in the past, when true affection was shown in circumstances of hardship, we shall support them with our greatest determination and strength in their effort to carry forward the movement against Vietnam and for national salvation; no matter how long the time is going to be, how great the price is going to be, we are going to support them to the very end. At the same time,

we need to remind the people of the whole world, especially the people of Southeast Asia: Vietnam's aggression against Kampuchea is absolutely not an isolated affair; it is the first step on the part of Soviet social imperialism to instigate Vietnam, this Cuba of the East, to carry out its expansion in Southeast Asia, and an integral part of Soviet social imperialism's worldwide strategic plan. If anyone should continue to indulge in appeasement, continue to placate it by means of detente, then today's Kampuchea will be tomorrow's Southeast Asian and other Asian-Pacific countries, and yesterday's Czechoslovakia would become the reflection of tomorrow's Europe and America. If no sufficient vigilance is aroused on this matter, if the people of the whole world continue to lag in making ideological preparations, a new world war will be inevitable, and will break out ahead of time. Vietnam has been carrying out naked aggression against Kampuchea on the one hand and, on the other hand, engineering one bloody incident after another along the Sino-Vietnamese border, making troubles, moving demarcation tablets, occupying more than 600 square kilometers of Chinese territory, and repeatedly ignoring our Government's protests. We have already issued statements to let the Vietnamese Government know clearly that our tolerance will have its limit. Comrades, today I represent the Party Central to indicate once again that the attitude we have adopted today is absolutely not any showing of weakness, but an effort to demonstrate limited tolerance according to the principles of rationality, potential benefit, and proper control. When we say we do not want a war today, that does not suggest that we will not fight a war in the future. If we are forced to the point of being able to do nothing else except to take action, then we shall not cringe from going to war and from fighting to win. We have already completed defense arrangements in the southwestern region; then why have we hesitated in taking action? First of all, we must create public opinion, let the governments of all countries of the world see clearly who is the perpetrator of bloody conflicts and who is the aggressor. Through toleration time and again, everybody would see the aggressive face of the Cuba of the East clearly. Only through such an expose can we push Vietnam to the stand of trial before the world, can we educate the people, including the Vietnamese people, can we exalt the morale of the vast ranks of our commanding officers. Justice is already in our hands; the people of the whole world are sympathizing with us and supporting us. When the time comes, we are surely going to be able to exert ourselves all at once and render it a thorough beating. The second point is that we cannot just look at the conflicts in Yunnan and Guangxi; we must see that this is on the surface merely a Sino-Vietnamese contention but in substance really a struggle between social imperialism and socialist China. From now on, we must immediately make ideological preparations and all necessary preparations; since social imperialism dares to start an aggressive war, we must have the determination to fight a boundless great war. Our attitude toward war has always been very clear; that is, first, we don't want it; and second, we are not afraid of it. If a war is imposed forcibly upon us, then we can only cope war with a war. Thirdly, even though we have already done our mobilization work and the morale of our commanding officers at the front is also high, and resolution letters are sent to Beijing like snow flakes, for the sake of blood-and-flesh friendship between the Vietnamese people and the Chinese people, in consideration of the Vietnamese people's interests so that as soon as they have achieved victory in their war against the United States and for national salvation they would not be entrapped in the fire of war again, we still entertain the last bit of hope, a hope that their government can change its ways and stop at the brink. Even though this chance is small, we still need to strive for it. If they still do as they please, and insist on pushing us toward to path of war, then we shall not mind meeting them in war, and drive them out. The Party Central Committee has recently issued a document, calling upon the whole party, the whole army, and the people of the whole country to do a good job in making practical preparations. The whole Party, the whole Army and the people of the whole country

must make such preparations in two ways: they must do a good job in managing their economy, and they must be prepared for war. Party organizations at various levels must grasp well economic management and also grasp well military work. We entirely believe that the heroic Kampuchean people and revolutionary forces will be able to overcome the Vietnamese aggressors; we also entirely believe that, so long as the whole Party, the whole army and the people of the whole country unite together, we can both do a good job in our production and drive out all aggressors who dare to come to attack us.

Now, I would also like to take a little time to relate to you on this occasion the Party Central Committee's directive on the question of the establishment of diplomatic relations between China and the United States. On 16 December last year, we and the United States simultaneously announced that the two sides were going to formally establish diplomatic relations on 1 January this year. This not only attracted the attention of all countries of the world, but different viewpoints and reactions also surfaced in different parts of this country. The relevant directive related was already issued on 17 December last year, and I believe everybody has already read it. The Party Central Committee has made it a rule that it must be read at all meetings in order to do a good job in the communication of ideas. I cannot do otherwise. The establishment of Sino-American diplomatic relations is a victory of the proletarian revolutionary line, and another proof of the nature of U.S. imperialism as a paper tiger, and not as an iron board. At present, U.S. imperialism is bogged down in a situation of converging domestic and international difficulties and great discomfiture; so it is easy to be befriended. But you must know that, even though the United States lacks any magnificent political goals, its scientific and technological development, new weaponry and economic resources are still very abundant and advanced. In this regard, it is going to be of great help to us. The establishment of new Sino-American relations can unite the forces of the two countries, and we must at the same time make use of such forces to unite the Third World and to win over the Second World so as to render common blows against the social-imperialist hegemony. This victory helps divide and disintegrate the reactionary clique of international class enemies, win a period of precious time, and win a part of external resources and capital so as to consolidate and develop our national economy and speedily realize our four modernizations. All this is beneficial to the accumulation of our strength, the strengthening of our army construction and national defense construction, the early realization of the motherland's unification, and the struggle for ultimate victory in the future war against aggression. Now I have finished what I wish to say.

9255

CSO: 4005

PARTY AND STATE

REFORMS NEEDED TO ALTER WIDESPREAD BUREAUCRATIC THINKING

Jinan DAZHONG RIBAO in Chinese 2 Oct 80 p 2

[Article by Zhao Shugan [6392 2885 1626]: "Uphold the Mass Line; Overcome Bureaucracy"]

[Text] In a speech delivered at the Third Plenary Session of the Fifth National People's Congress, Comrade Hua Guofeng put forward an important task: to overcome bureaucracy and improve the work of the government. He solemnly pointed out: "Bureaucracy not only has obstructed economic reform and the progress of construction of the four modernizations, but it has also obstructed all of our work. It has long aroused the strong indignation of the people." At present, the phenomenon of bureaucracy exists extensively in government organizations at all levels. This is indeed a very serious problem, and now it is the time that this problem must be solved. In order to alter this situation, the most important thing is to carry out a thorough reform of the current political and economic administrative systems. At the same time, feudalism and bourgeois ideology must also be criticized from an ideological point of view, so that a sense of the mass line can be firmly established.

The mass line of the party is the line for the masses to liberate themselves. History is made by the masses. The working class can accomplish its own historical mission only by relying on the strength of its own class and that of the laboring people as a whole. Unlike the political parties of the bourgeoisie, the political party of the working class does not regard the masses as its own instrument, but consciously maintains that it itself is the instrument for the masses to accomplish a specific historical mission in a specific historical era. The reason why it has become an advanced force and plays a significant leading role among the masses is because it is the wholehearted servant of the masses, because it reflects their interests and their will, and because it strives to organize the masses to struggle to fulfill their own interests. It does not possess any power that transcends the masses. The mass line of the party strictly demands us to let the masses liberate themselves. The overall task of the party is to wholeheartedly serve the people. The party's leading role is to correctly point out to the people the direction of struggle and to help them use their own hands to surmount all difficulties to struggle for building our motherland into a modernized great power and for realizing the supreme ideal of mankind—a socialist society. The practice of the Chinese revolutionary struggle led by the party has proved: No matter whether it is achieved in the period of democratic revolution or in the period of

socialist construction, every great success achieved by us has been the result of relying on the masses and faithfully carrying out the mass line of the party. Following the implementation of the party's general line in the new era and the shift in the focus of party work, it is more than ever necessary to carry out the mass line of the party continuously and conscientiously, in order to unite the people of the whole nation to wage a protracted and tenacious struggle with one heart and one mind.

In practical work, bureaucratic malpractices which run counter to the mass line of the party are a common occurrence. First there are overstaffed and overlapping administrative organizations. There are those persons who enjoy high positions and live in clover, yet are irresponsible and tend to shift responsibilities onto each other. They are not concerned about the well-being of the masses. They remain indifferent toward the opinions and demands of the masses. Second, there are those who are divorced from objective reality or have lost contact with the practice of struggle. When they ponder a question or make a decision for work, they divorce themselves from the masses and from reality. They act blindly by relying only on personal imagination. They carry out instructions from higher levels mechanically, acting in compliance with administrative orders without taking note of the current situation. Third, there are those who work only in a mechanical way without paying attention to actual results. They report the good news but not the bad. They practice fraud and fish for fame and compliments. Fourth, there are those who are busy with official documents and correspondence and indulge in meetings. They are red-tapists and routinists. Fifth, there are those who are strict toward others but broadminded with themselves. They care only about their personal fame, authority, and interests, but are indifferent to the gratitude, resentment, and distresses of the masses. They attach primary importance to factionalism and put party spirit second. Sixth, there are those who take the individual for the collective and the collective for the individual, and also the individual for the masses and the masses for the individual. They exaggerate the role of the individual and abuse their authority. They violate the law and discipline. They retaliate against those who criticize them. The above mentioned are among those who have caused enormous losses to the party and the people.

Bureaucracy is a manifestation of the rule of feudal patriarchy. People who are contaminated by such a style of thinking are basically unaware that they are merely servants of the people, and that they have only the duty to serve the masses but not the right to stand high above them. Of course, they also do not understand that a party and its members are able to point out the correct direction to lead the masses to march forward only through conscientiously accumulating the experience and pooling the wisdom of the masses. The mass line of the party itself requires us to maintain a modest and prudent attitude and to cultivate a style of work in order to enable us to serve the people, consult the masses when matters arise, and share the comforts and hardships of the masses. In order to overcome bureaucracy, we must uphold the mass line of the party, break through outmoded conventions and customs, and reform our regulations and systems by criticizing the residual influence of feudalism and bourgeois ideology so that our work will become more adaptable to the situation and needs in implementing the four modernizations.

9560

CSO: 4005

PARTY AND STATE

IMPORTANCE OF CONSIDERING EVERYONE'S VIEWS STRESSED

Tianjin TIANJIN RIBAO in Chinese 12 Sep 80 p 2

[Article by Lu Man [7120 3355]: "We Must Listen to Different Opinions"]

[Text] Isn't it good to have different opinions in doing a job, holding a meeting, or solving a problem? Some persons feel that in order to do a job smoothly, to hold a meeting successfully, or to solve a problem satisfactorily, it is better to have identical views. It is easy to get bored once there are different opinions.

What is opinion? Opinion is a certain kind of idea and a way of looking at something. In view of the fact that everybody is in a different situation, is at a different ideological level, and looks at a problem from a different angle, it is a normal phenomenon for each one to have a different understanding of things. Different opinions can be discussed or debated, and sometimes they are not totally opposite; thereby we can learn from or help each other to make up each other's deficiencies and draw on collective wisdom to absorb all ideas that are useful.

For instance, speeches made at the recent session of the National People's Congress were realistic and straightforward, sharp and sincere, and appeared to be vigorous and greatly satisfy the people. Indeed, it is necessary to listen to different opinions. To listen to other's views is to see whether their views are better than our own and whether some of their views are acceptable. On the contrary, we may also consider whether our own ideas are well rounded and whether they are correct. Even opposite opinions may sometimes help regain one's own sober thinking and thereby help to prevent us from making mistakes. Of course, wrong opinions may also emerge. However, isn't it good to distinguish clearly between right and wrong through a comparison of that which is correct with that which is mistaken? At present, while we are carrying out the construction of the four modernizations, we face a lot of new problems due to lack of experience. Therefore, we need more than ever to listen to more opinions, to different opinions, and even to opposite opinions. This is extremely advantageous to us to minimize blindness, to maintain sober thinking, and to advance daringly.

The accident of the capsizing of the drilling vessel Bohai No 2 shows that once a person becomes arrogant, it is hard for him to listen to different opinions. If certain leading cadres had listened to different opinions or handled things more carefully, the accident would never have been allowed to happen in the first

place. Yet, the result was that "we, the sovereign, have made the decision, and no advice is necessary"; this caused the vessel to capsize and resulted in many casualties. The so-called getting things into a mess by giving wrong orders refers not only to the problem of pretending to know what one really doesn't know, but also to the problem of being blindly self-confident. To forecast high winds is in itself not a sophisticated matter; yet some people want to go so far as to "do things right away" in order to display an unparalleled posture of "I dare to have the final say." Being a leader, it is easy for one to become malleasant or even to commit serious crimes if he becomes arrogant and considers himself always in the right without listening to different opinions.

Haughtiness and bureaucratic airs are the shadows of some leading cadres. It may become even worse if one who is arrogant does not exercise his authority properly. Things that go this way can really be viewed as the rump of a tiger, which makes one fearful to look at, not to mention to touch. A person like this who takes charge of a job or presides over a meeting usually feels that he is 100-percent right and has unanimous support. Prior to holding a meeting, he proposes in advance to prevent differing opinions from arising. This does not mean that he either is or is not willing to accept different opinions, but rather that he is basically not inclined to listen to others, or even to allow others to speak out.

The incident of the capsizing of the drilling vessel Bohai No 2 reflects the fact that some leading cadres treat differing opinions just this way. Wrong decisions made by them are for the purpose of carrying out instructions of higher levels, but suggestions made by lower levels are different. They do not listen in the least to the opinions of persons at lower levels, no matter how good or how realistic these suggestions might be, because what is in their mind is that they are responsible only to higher levels. Judging from this, it is obvious that in order to listen to others' opinions with an open mind, it is necessary to correct the line of thinking, to start off from reality, and to seek truth from facts. This is what makes us responsible to our work, to the people, and to higher levels.

Being good at listening to different opinions is an indication that one is adept in his work, conscientious, and responsible. A segment of the libretto in "15 Guan" which Kuang Zhong sings reads: This pen weighs 1,000 jin. When it falls, it kills two. After having heard a man and a woman who had been sentenced to death crying out about their grievances, he discovered flaws in the case and therefore hesitated to make a court decision. This example can be considered as accepting different opinions even when those who cry out about their grievances are the litigants themselves. If crying out about grievances is considered making trouble and the flaws discovered are set aside, no wonder those two innocent lives were destined to be doomed. In the case of the capsizing of the drilling vessel Bohai No 2, the leading cadre who made the mistake was holding in his hand a pen weighing almost 10,000 jin. How could he do his work in such haste without conscientiously listening to different opinions!

Truths, facts, and lessons all tell us that we must listen to different opinions.

PARTY AND STATE

PRACTICE SAID SOLE CRITERION FOR TESTING TRUTH

Beijing ZHEXUE YANJIU [PHILOSOPHICAL RESEARCH] in Chinese No 8, Aug 80 pp 13-16,12

[Article by Ma Ming [7456 7686]: "Neither Aim Nor Benefit Is the Criterion for Testing Truth"]

[Text] How is the problem proposed?

Some comrades say that if we use the success or failure of practice to test the correctness or error of knowledge, what criterion do we use to weigh the success or failure of practice? In fact, there is a criterion for this, and it is the objective of the practice. As Comrade Mao Zedong said, "A communist's every word and action must serve the greatest benefit of the broadest masses of people, and the highest criterion is what is supported by the broadest masses of people." Therefore, the conclusion is that "everything that conforms to the benefit of the people is successful practice, and everything that damages the welfare of the people is failed practice. We must use this criterion to judge the success or failure of our practice, and from this to test the truth or falsity of our knowledge." Some comrades ask, if practice is the criterion, and the welfare of the people is also the standard, how can it be said that we believe the criterion of truth and the political criterion to be completely uniform."

It was in this way that the problem of "people's welfare" as a criterion was raised. Moreover, it was felt that the aim of practice, that is to say, the greatest benefit to the people, can be used not only to judge the success or failure of practice, but to test the truth or falsity of knowledge as well. Some comrades said, "This is the embodiment of the practice criterion." We do not agree with these views. Following is a discussion of some of our simple opinions on this problem.

I. I believe that the foregoing quote from Comrade Mao Zedong is no doubt completely correct, but it is untenable to use that as a basis for proposing a "benefit criterion." It should be clear that when we discuss what is the criterion for examining truth, this is an epistemological question. When Comrade Mao Zedong here speaks of a criterion for examining and discriminating between the words and deeds of our Communist Party members, it is not an epistemological question. Making the criterion Comrade Mao Zedong spoke of into the embodiment of the practice criterion is mixing up two questions of different natures and different categories. There are two points that should be differentiated here. First, examining the

correctness or error of a bit of knowledge (the criterion of truth) and judging whether an act (work, practice) is good or bad, or has succeeded or failed, are two questions of different natures. Whether man's knowledge is correct or not can only be examined through social practice; judging whether man's behavior (practice) is right or wrong must be weighed against some different standard, a political criterion, a moral criterion, etc. There is fundamentally no way to make the criterion for judging practice the criterion for examining knowledge. Second, the practice criterion and the political criterion are two different categories and can not be confused with one another. Practice is the only criterion for examining truth, and this is an epistemological category; the criterion proposed by Comrade Mao Zedong for judging the words and deeds of Communist Party members, which is to say whether or not they represented the greatest benefit to the greatest number of people and whether or not they received the support of the broadest masses of people, etc., is a political criterion and belongs to the political category. While discussing the practice criterion of epistemology, we have introduced a political criterion and have stressed only the unanimity of the two, without specifying under what circumstances they are unanimous and under what circumstances they are not unanimous. It is just because of this that some comrades confuse the political criterion with the practice criterion, and confuse questions of the epistemological category with questions of the political category. Thus, not only are we unable to clarify the questions, we are only able to confuse them further.

If we make the criterion proposed by Mao Zedong the standard for examining truth, we can see what an absurd situation it will land us in. First, Mao Zedong said "Every word and act of a Communist Party member must conform to the greatest benefit to the broadest masses of people." Benefits can be distinguished as high or low, big or small, more or less. If this is made the criterion for examining truth, can we say that a large benefit means a large truth and a small benefit means a small truth? Clearly, we cannot say this. Next, Comrade Mao Zedong also said "The highest criterion is what is supported by the broadest masses of people." Could we then say that what most people support is the truth, and what most people do not support is not true, but a fallacy? Of course we cannot say this. If the criterion of truth is whether or not something obtains the support of most of the people, then, as Lenin pointed out, "we can say that the doctrine of the Catholic church is true." ("Selected Works of Lenin," Vol 2, p 122), because Catholicism had the support of most people during a certain period and within a certain area. If obtaining the support of most of the people is made the criterion of truth, then there is no objective truth. From this we see that it is a mistake to confuse two questions of different natures and different categories. If we assume that the political criterion Mao Zedong proposed for judging practice is the criterion for the examination of truth, it is deliberate distortion of Comrade Mao Zedong's original meaning.

II. Practice is the substantive activity of man's purposeful transformation of the objective world. The purpose of practice is of course included among the essential factors of practice. Can we say that the purpose of practice is to provide a criterion for the examination of truth? We cannot. Because purpose is a thing of the subjective category, it cannot be independently made the criterion for the examination of truth, this is clear. However, some comrades suggest that the purpose of practice is a criterion for the success or failure of practice. Since we have also said that our highest purpose is the greatest benefit to the broadest

masses of people and that the standard of the people's benefit is unanimous with the standard of practice, then it seems as though the purpose of practice can also become a standard for examining the truth or falsity of knowledge. This makes the question even more confused.

The purpose of practice is a subjective category, but whether or not it correctly represents objective reality can be examined by practice. The success of practice proves the unanimity of our original conception (purpose) with objective reality. If practice fails, it shows that the originally conceived purpose does not conform to reality and is erroneous. Purpose must be examined through practice. But now what is contrarily being said is that the purpose of practice is a criterion for judging the success or failure of practice, and this completely inverts the relationship between subjective and objective. If practice examines purpose and purpose also judges (which is also examining) practice, besides leading us into a circular argument, this cannot advance the question in the slightest.

Some comrades say that since practice includes the purpose of practice, the method, the target, the procedure, the result, and other elements, then practice as a criterion for the examination of truth implies that the included purpose of practice can become the criterion for the examination of truth. There are also some comrades who say that making practice the criterion is the same as making the subjective purpose the criterion for examining truth, and this introduces subjective idealism, which is not clearly differentiated from pragmatism. We feel that although these two viewpoints are proposed from different quarters, they both isolate a single element of practice from the whole process of practice, and so both are erroneous. Practice is a process of subjectively seeing something in the objective, and the various elements of practice are a unified indivisible whole. Departing from the whole process of practice is departing from the unified whole of practice, and no element of practice can exist independently. Without the process of practice, where would the purpose of practice come from; without the process of practice we could not talk of the results of practice. When practice is made the criterion for examining truth, it should be comprehended as a whole, which is to say as the total of the whole process, and we must not take some one of its elements in isolation to be, singlehandedly, a criterion for the examination of truth. If we depart from the whole process of practice and discuss the purpose of practice independently, there is no purpose for action, so it is a kind of pure subjective fantasy, and this purpose cannot be the purpose of practice, so naturally it cannot be the criterion for the examination of truth. The purpose of practice can only have significance as a part of the whole process of practice, transforming subjective intentions into objective reality. It is through the process of practice and its results that people examine the truth of knowledge. The results of practice are the substantiation and embodiment of purpose. This is an objective material criterion and so is clearly differentiated from pragmatism and other subjective theories of criteria of one sort and another. Practice of course includes a specific purpose, but purpose alone cannot be the criterion for examining truth, the reason being as given here.

Some comrades say that the purpose of Communist Party members is to seek the greatest benefit for the people, and that this is the fundamental point of departure and home base of all of our work, so "people's welfare" is the highest criterion for examining the truth or falsity of our party's policies and theories. We must ask, how then will we know if the party's policies and theories conform to the

greatest benefit of the masses? This must still be examined through practice. What is the greatest benefit of the people? This is a relatively complex question, including long-term benefit and also including immediate benefit, overall benefit as well as partial benefit. Starting from the purpose of seeking the greatest benefit, how to realize in practical terms the various items of policy and measures cannot be solved simply on the basis of purpose and point of departure, but must be examined through practice to see whether or not they really embody the greatest benefit of the people. Take for example the setting of a production norm. After all, does a 10 percent production increase or a 100 percent (doubling) production increase best conform to the greatest benefit to the masses? If we proceed purely from purpose, there is no doubt that there is greater benefit to a 100 percent increase than in a 10 percent increase in production. However, if the results of practice show that this is a "high norm" divorced from reality, not only will its result not provide people with the greatest benefit, it may even cause great harm. We need only think back to the concept of "running toward communism" of 1958. Wasn't its purpose the benefit of the people? Why then was it not true? Because it was totally divorced from the actual circumstances, practice showed it to be in error. Therefore, when we speak of purpose and benefit to the people apart from reality, not only can it not be a criterion for examining truth, it can easily provide a theoretical basis for erroneous lines of the "left" or right.

III. Some comrades, using the unanimity of truth and the people's benefit as an argument, say that making the "people's benefit" a criterion for examining the truth or falsity of knowledge is just the complementing and particularization of the practice criterion. This formulation cannot be established.

The so-called unanimity of the practice criterion and the political criterion is only accurate within a specific scope. That is, as far as the knowledge and practice of the proletariat and the Communist Party members are concerned, because our party uses Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought as a guide and to represent the proletariat and the greatest benefit to the masses of people. The scientific nature and the class nature of Marxism-Leninism are also completely in agreement. Therefore, our party's knowledge of a given affair, and the policies and measures that are adopted, when shown to be correct through examination in practice, are also certainly the best representation of the greatest benefit to the broadest masses of people. Only within these limits, the results of examination in practice and the criterion of the people's welfare, which is to say, the practice criterion and the political criterion, are in complete agreement. However, when we discuss the problem of the criterion of truth, we are not speaking only of the knowledge and practice of Communist Party members, but we include the knowledge and practice of all people. Everyone's knowledge must be subject to examination by practice, and everyone's social practice can become the objective criterion for examining truth. For example, bourgeois knowledge of certain questions of the natural world and human society, when proved correct through examination in practice, should be acknowledged as objective truth in their command of these questions. Then, does this mean that it also conforms to the greatest benefit for the masses of people? Clearly not. Imperialist command of the secrets of rocketry and the atom (the objective truths concerning atomic fission as well as electronic technology, etc), when used to build weapons that will kill people, seek world domination. Can we say that this conforms to the greatest benefit for the greatest number of people? In this, the practice criterion and the political criterion are completely in-

consistent. Therefore, either we must not acknowledge imperialism's command of atomic secrets as objective truth (of course this violates common sense), or we must acknowledge that the people's welfare cannot be universally applied as a criterion for examining truth. Our conclusion is that the benefit criterion and the practice criterion are two different criteria, and we cannot simply say that the benefit criterion is the substantiation of the practice criterion, but that the two cannot be confused.

Consequently, some comrades declare that we discuss questions only in the realm of social science, and "how to prove the truths of natural science is not within the scope of our discussions." This kind of limitation is of no help whatsoever. This is because no matter whether it is natural science or social science, the only criterion for examining whether it is true or not is practice. The differences in form between production struggle, class struggle, and scientific experiment do not alter the fact that they are all the essence of man's social practice. The reason some comrades what to make such a declaration is simply that they feel that the "benefit" criterion does not apply in the realm of natural science because the bourgeoisie can also command the truth of natural science, and that does not represent the benefit of the greatest number of people. Therefore, does the "benefit" criterion hold for the realm of social sciences? We feel that it likewise does not apply. This is because although the bourgeoisie does not have complete command of the objective truth of the laws of social development, they can acknowledge and can command some individual, specific, and partial social historical truths. For example, the existence of classes and the mutual struggle between classes was initially proposed by bourgeois historians. If the proletariat can be acknowledged, the bourgeoisie can also be acknowledged, so who does this represent the greatest benefit to, and who is harmed by it? Furthermore, in considering one period after another of China's ancient history, how can we use the criterion of people's welfare to examine whose proposition was true? Therefore, making "benefit" the substantiation of the practice criterion to examine the truth of social science is likewise inapplicable.

Some comrades say that we are only discussing questions of a criterion for whether the party line, policies, and theories are true or false. Can it be that the greatest benefit to the broadest masses of people is not the highest criterion for examining the truth or falsity of the party's line, policies, and theory? Our answer is still a denial. As we have already pointed out, although the practice criterion for examining the truth or falsity of knowledge and the people's benefit criterion are consistent as far as Communist Party members are concerned, this definitely does not mean that we can use the people's benefit criterion as a substitute for the practice criterion. Comrade Mao Zedong said, "People's knowledge, having been tested in practice, can produce a great leap. The significance of this leap will be even greater than that of the leap that preceded it. It is because only by having this leap can we prove the first leap in knowledge, which is that the thinking, theory, policies, plans, methods, etc, obtained from the process of reflection of the objective external world are after all correct and not in error, and except for this there is no other method of examining truth." The people's benefit as a criterion at most proves that party policy is only correct when it conforms to the benefit of the people. Whether or not a specific item of policy conforms to the benefit of the people cannot be examined and proved until it has undergone practice, and only through practice can we prove whether

or not party policies are consistent with actual circumstances, whether they conform to (or reflect) the highest benefit to the people. Therefore, in the final analysis, practice is the only criterion for examining whether or not the party line, policies, and theories are correct, and any other criterion proposed is incorrect.

IV. Making the people's welfare a criterion for examining truth is using a subjective criterion as an objective criterion and must lead to a denial of the objectivity of truth, confusing Marxism with pragmatism.

What we call truth is correct knowledge of the essence of the objective world and its regularity. Since the world stands alone outside of man's consciousness, its objective existence does not depend on man's consciousness. Therefore, the content of truth is completely objective and is independent of man's will and benefit. Therefore, it is also called objective truth. Since truth is objective, how can benefit be made the criterion for examining truth? Because benefit is mutually connected with the main body (man or a certain group of men), and furthermore is always inseparable from man's subjective desires. We cannot discuss any benefit apart from this main body of people. In a class society, benefit has a class nature. If we make "people's benefit" the criterion for examining truth, it is a criterion for examining objective truth according to the benefit or harm to the main body, and is substituting a subjective criterion for an objective criterion. Everything that conforms with the benefit of the people is truth, and everything that does not conform with the benefit of the people is falsehood. Isn't this the same as saying that truth cannot exist apart from this main body of people? Is it also the same as saying that there can be no truth that does not depend on the main body or that does not depend on mankind, that there can be no objective truth. Denying the existence of objective truth is unavoidably standing at the side of idealism.

Making "benefit" the criterion for examining truth is precisely a confusion with the pragmatic view of truth. The basic point of the pragmatic view of truth is that truth is usefulness, and "if something is useful, then it is true." It does not recognize the objectivity of the world and its laws, and therefore also denies objective truth. It assumes that truth is only a product of subjective experience, a thing that satisfies man's subjective needs, it is a method devised by man to cope with his environment, and it is a useful tool for man. The pragmatic view of truth is a subjective and idealistic view of truth. It only acknowledges using subjective criteria for examining truth and denies the objectivity of the criterion of truth. If we make the benefit of the main body the criterion for examining truth, even if we imagine this main body to be the proletariat or the masses of people, the result cannot be much different from the conclusions reached by pragmatism.

In summary, practice is the only criterion for the examination of truth, and there can be no other criterion aside from it. If we make the purpose of practice or the benefit of the people the criterion for examining truth, it must lead to the substitution of a subjective criterion for an objective criterion, and it will lead to a denial of the objectivity of truth, and from this, to a confusion of Marxism with the realms of idealism and pragmatism.

(Composed from statements made at a philosophical discussion held in June 1980)

PARTY AND STATE

COLUMN ON EDUCATION IN HISTORICAL MATERIALISM LAUNCHED

Hangzhou ZHEJIANG RIBAO in Chinese 7 Oct 80 p 4

[Article by Wang Jiayang [3769 1367 2254]: "We Must Pay Attention to Propagation of and Education in Historical Materialism"]

[Text] Marxist historical materialism is the world view of the proletariat. Historical materialism affirms that the masses of people are the creators of history and the decisive power in the development of history. A proletarian political party must correctly recognize and deal with the relationships between leadership, political parties, classes, and the masses and must trust the masses, rely on the masses, and faithfully represent the masses' will and desires throughout the course of socialist revolution and socialist construction for the benefit of the broadest masses of people. Since the founding of our country, both positive and negative aspects of practice have proved that when our party's line, guiding principle, policy, and the party's actual work have embodied the welfare and requirements of the broad masses of people and adhered to the basic principles of historical materialism, we have been able to arouse the people, mobilize and organize the masses to struggle for their own benefit, and our affairs thus succeeded and developed. Otherwise, they encountered setback and defeat. After the breakup of the "gang of four," the Party Central Committee reviewed historical experience and promptly proposed shifting the key task of the whole party to economic construction, proposed the grand mission of building our country into a strong, modern socialist nation, and thus completely embodied the fundamental benefit and common desires of the people of the whole country. To realize this glorious and arduous task, we must have favorable conditions in all aspects. Of these, one fundamental condition is that we must trust and rely on the broad masses of people, fully develop socialist democracy, and truly allow the masses of people to be master in their own house in the nation's political life, economic life, social life and such areas, to fully develop the activism, creativity, intelligence and wisdom of the masses. Without this condition, our affairs cannot succeed.

In reviewing the initial period after the founding of the country, our party carried on very wide education in historical materialism among the cadres and the masses. For example, party schools on all levels and cadre schools of all kinds all made this one of their important courses and universally organized the cadres to study the principles of Marxist philosophy and the history of social development: in the rural land reform and the urban democratic reforms, we developed

mass education in "Who lives off whom?" etc. This raised the consciousness of the cadres in recognizing that labor had created the world and the truth that the masses are the real heroes, and that the cadres should serve the people, established the viewpoint that we should rely on the masses with all our hearts and souls, developed the excellent tradition of the party's mass line, and all achieved very good results.

However, we should see that after winning victory throughout the country, our party became a governing party. This change in the status of the party held the danger of easily developing subjectivism, bureaucratism, and commandism divorced from the masses, and held the danger of some cadres easily changing from public servants into lords of the people. Beginning in the late 1950's, some cadres in the party really did develop a spirit of arrogance and of claiming credit for themselves, self-worship, and exaggerating the function of the individual, and the development of individuals deciding important questions and other circumstances weakened and damaged the party's system of democratic centralism and principle of collective leadership, socialist democracy failed to develop, and at times there was not even any respect for the welfare of the masses. In 10 years of creating confusion, the Lin Biao-Jiang Qing mob took advantage of the mistakes of the party leadership, advocated a hero view of history, fabricated modern superstition, began a deification movement, and made "loyalty to the leader" the highest political conviction of people throughout the country. On the other hand, they despised the masses and fundamentally did not care whether they lived or died, and they instituted a fascist "overall dictatorship" against the cadres and the masses. As a result, the pernicious influence of feudal autocracy spread unchecked, and the idealistic view of history became rampant. The party's world view was seriously eroded. This pernicious influence was such that it blunted the concern of many of our comrades for historical materialism, even making them forget it. At that time, when there were still irregularities and unhealthy circumstances in our party life and social life, such as bureaucratism, a family-head system, one person having the say, a special privilege mentality and the seeking of privileges, serious waste and loss to the financial resources of the country through blind subjective leadership, as well as no one who was concerned about the production safety or immediate welfare of the masses, etc, which in the final analysis were all inseparable from the deviation from and violation of the basic principles of historical materialism, deviation from the will of the masses, and the inversion of the relationship between the cadres and the masses. All of the foregoing shows that the implementation of effective propaganda and education in historical materialism for the party members and cadres, carrying on education in serving the people with the whole heart and soul and being a good servant of the people, clearing out the various pernicious influences of historical idealism, clearing away the remnant influences of feudalism, and preventing erosion by bourgeois thinking all have urgent theoretical and practical significance.

Implementation of propagation of and education in historical materialism must be centered on the four modernizations, must maintain the principle of integrating theory with reality, must clearly distinguish between historical materialism and the idealistic view of history through discussions of problems in present-day life, sift out various kinds of foolish notions, encourage reform of the national management system, the administrative agencies work system, and the cadre system, strengthen the system of cadre inspection and oversight, improve party leadership, bring about advances in our work and style, and promote modernization.

In carrying on propagation of and education in historical materialism at the present time, I feel that we must emphasize raising the cadres' recognition of the historical position and historical effect of the masses, set right the positions of the cadres and the masses, and improve the relationships between the cadres and masses that were damaged by the Ling Biao-Jiang Qing mob.

We must firmly establish the viewpoint that "history is the history of the masses." We must really make clear the difference between historical materialism and the idealistic view of history, whether history is after all the history of the masses of people or the history of a few heroes and leaders, whether we will trust in and rely on the masses or have blind faith in ourselves. The history of social development is the history of the development of production, the history of constant development and transformation of social and productive style, and is the history of development of productive force and productive relations, so it cannot but be the history of the producers of the material goods themselves, cannot but be the history of the laboring masses. The masses of people are the creators of society's material wealth and spiritual wealth, and they are the decisive force in transforming society and in moving history forward. In countries where the socialist revolution has achieved victory, the people are the true masters of their country. People being masters in their own house should not be an idle saying, but should be seen practically as a real practice. The responsibility of the party leadership is to educate and arouse the masses' recognition of their historical position and historical mission, and believe firmly that there never has been any saviour, that they must depend on themselves for their salvation; we must further develop socialist democracy and the legal system to make it possible for the broad masses to exercise their right to manage government affairs, economic affairs, and social affairs effectively. Our economic construction and the various items of work must respect the desires of the broad masses of people, proceed from the immediate and long-term benefit of the masses, uphold the mass line, consult with the masses when matters arise, be concerned with the important questions of vital interest to the masses, and definitely not be settled by the decisions of one man or a few men.

We must firmly establish the view that the cadres are the "public servants" of the masses. The various grades of party cadre must consciously accept the inspection and oversight by the masses, become used to listening to the opinions and criticisms of the masses, and be good servants of the people. Whether the cadres are the servants of the people or the lords of the people standing over their heads is yet another difference between historical materialism and the idealistic view of history. We should not regard the masses as the party's tools, but the party as the tool to be used by the masses in completing the historical tasks of a specific historical period. Therefore, whether a cadre's position is high or low, he should place himself in the midst of the masses, share their comforts and hardships, become one with them, discuss affairs with them on an equal footing, spare no effort on behalf of the people's welfare, and definitely not sit on the backs of the masses, lording it over them and seeking his own benefit. In his speech to the Third Session of the Fifth National People's Congress, Comrade Hua Guofeng pointed out: "The greater a man's power and merit, the greater his political responsibility and moral responsibility to serve as a model for the people, for the workers of the lower ranks, and for the children of the next generation." The thinking and viewpoint that the masses are subjects

under one's control, establishing relationships of attaching oneself to some other person, being responsible only to superiors, not being responsible to the masses, regarding anything good done for the people as a "favor" to the people, and feeling that they of course ought to receive "gratitude gifts" from the people, etc., are all manifestations of feudal thinking and bourgeois thinking, and are intolerable to historical materialism.

Third is that we must correctly recognize the effect of the individual on history, apply great efforts to study and do good work. While historical materialism confirms the great effect of the masses of people on history, it does not deny the effect of the individual. The question is to see whether the actions of the individual conform to and reflect the laws of social development at that time, and whether they represent the welfare and demands of the broad masses of people. The appearance of any outstanding person always requires that the people give him space and sunlight before he can flourish and develop. In the long stream of historical development, in the production, work, and struggle of the masses, the people need leaders and choose them to manage things for the people, and seek their own liberation. Often, the leadership is not a single person, but a circle or a large group. After this leadership mounts the stage of history, it must still maintain an intimate relationship with the masses, and not cut off the wisdom and strength that flows from the masses, but develop the outstanding competence of the individual to make his own contribution to the development of history. Leaders like this should naturally enjoy the deepest love and esteem of the masses. In clarifying this question, we must not neglect the responsibilities of the leadership. We must improve and strengthen party leadership, develop the core leadership function of the party organization, develop the role of the party branch as a fighting bastion, and develop the roles of Communist Party members as models of the vanguard. To be a leader, one should apply even more effort to the study of theory, the study of cultural and scientific knowledge, and of professional knowledge, conform to the historical trend of the times and the expectations of the people, and make a positive contribution to the four modernizations.

The initiation of a column on "Carrying On Re-education in Historical Materialism" by the ZHEJIANG RIBAO is a very significant thing. We hope that everyone will actively develop ideas and strive together to make this column a success.

To the Readers:

Communist Party members and revolutionaries should understand the basic common knowledge about historical materialism and respect its basic principles. However, because of the 10 years of chaos caused by the Lin Biao-Jiang Qing mob, people forgot about the basic common knowledge of historical materialism and the idealistic view of history has run rampant. Some people may be able to give a very clear and logical oral recitation of the principles of historical materialism, but their actions are something completely different. In view of these circumstances, we have begun a special column on "Carrying On Re-education in Historical Materialism." Historical materialism is involved in a great many questions, and this column will emphasize the solution of the problems of how to deal with the masses correctly. To this end, we have selected a number of subjects to reflect on and here provide them for everyone's review.

Is it heroes who create history, or is it slaves?

How can we recognize the historical effect of outstanding persons? What is the relationship between proletarian leaders and the masses of people? Should the people be loyal to their leaders, or should the leaders be loyal to the people?

Why must we "apply less propaganda to the individual"? Why must we oppose blind faith in the individual and worship of the individual?

Why do we say that "one person having the say," "the head of household system," bureaucratism, lifetime appointments to cadre leadership, and various kinds of special privilege are all things of the idealistic view of history? How can we overcome these abuses?

If the people are the "masters" and the cadres are the "public servants," why do some cadres invert the relationship between "master" and "public servant"? Where is the reason? What must we do to be able to set the relationship between these two right again? How should we guarantee that the masses of people can fully exercise their democratic rights and develop their role as "master"?

In the new historical period, how can we strengthen the mass viewpoint (including trusting the masses, the viewpoint of liberating oneself, the viewpoint of doing everything for the masses and serving the people with our whole heart and soul, the viewpoint of being responsible to the people in everything, and the viewpoint of learning from the people in everything)? How can we best follow the mass line?

We welcome everyone's enthusiastic efforts to compose articles around these subjects. You can write specialized essays or short peices; you can discuss something learned from experience or write comments on something you have read. There are no requirements for form and no limits on length. Say what's on your mind and everyone freely express his views. Present the facts and reason things out, try to strike home at current abuses, and discuss problems clearly on the basis of a combination of theory and practice.

The Editors

9284

CSO: 4005

SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

WRITERS, POLITICIANS URGED TO WORK FOR MODERNIZATION

Tianjin XINGANG in Chinese No 3, Mar 80 pp 79-83, 91

[Article by Guo Fengqi [6753 7685 1477], Fang Bojing [2455 0130 2417], and Fan Hongbing [5400 4767 0365]: "Literary and Art Works Cannot Be Separated From Politics"]

[Text] At present, a debate has taken place over the issue of the relationship between work in the literary and artistic fields and politics, an issue that is now at the heart of the theory of literature and art, the principle of creative writing and literary and artistic reviews. We feel that the proposal "to attach literature and art to politics" is not a scientific approach. But we also want to say that literature and art cannot be, in one way or another, separated from politics, and must go hand in hand with politics.

I

Before proceeding to talk about the relationship between work in the literary and artistic fields and politics, we must first clearly understand what politics and literature and art really mean. According to the basic Marxist viewpoint, both politics and literature and art are part of the superstructure. The superstructure which serves the economic base can be divided into the following two parts: First, the political and legal systems including the army, police and courts; second, sociological ideas, including politics, legal viewpoints, religions, codes of ethics, philosophy and literature and art. Based on this fact, politics refers not only to the political system but also to the political doctrines and viewpoints in the sociological and ideological fields; literature and art are part of the social ideology and a reflection of politics and economics in a specific society. A discussion about the relationship between work in the literary and artistic fields and politics must be accompanied by a discussion about the relationship between literature and art on the one hand and politics on the other.

Marx said that the whole relations of production make up "the socio-economic structure on top of which stands the legal and political aspects of the superstructure, and at the bottom of which is a solid base coupled with a specific social ideology." ("Preface to 'The Criticism of Political Economy'") This indicates that as part of the social ideology, literature and art are in rapport with the specific political system; a specific political system requires a specific form of literature and art that can echo its needs; in the process of developing

and formulating its political system, a specific class also needs a specific form of literature and art to create public opinions in favor of such a struggle; as soon as that political system is established, literature and art will be required to play a role in defending, improving and consolidating it.

While maintaining harmonious relations with politics, literature and art are subordinate to the economic base and must echo and serve its needs just as politics does. Nevertheless, the position of literature and art and that of politics in the superstructure are at variance with each other. For example, politics which is the concentrated expression of economics occupies a dominant position in the superstructure and can have greater and more direct impact on the economic base, while literature and art is a reflection of the economic base, playing a role of checks and balances with politics. Normally, they have no direct impact on the economic base but can make their influence felt there through the political channels.

This analysis of the roles of literature and art and politics in the superstructure shows that the relationship of literature and art to politics is not one of servants to their master, although they cannot be separated from each other. The history of the development of literature and art in socialist society powerfully proves that never before have literature and art been separated from politics nor is it likely in the future.

Some comrades have epitomized the relationship of literature and art to politics during the period of the reactionary rule as one of "rivalry." This theory of "rivalry" has been proven theoretically untenable and incorrect by Lu Xun. In a speech delivered by the end of 1927, Lu Xun said: "I always feel that literature and art never stop clashing with politics; originally, literature and art are not opposed to the revolution because they share the same feeling of discontent with the status quo. But politics has the tendency of maintaining the status quo, and therefore is moving in a direction of clash with literature and art, which reflect discontent with the status quo." (Speech to Shanghai Jinan University: "Difference Between Literature and Art and Politics") We understand that "politics" in that speech by Lu Xun refers to the reactionary political system designed to defend the economic base of the exploiting classes; "literature and art which reflect discontent with the status quo" refers to the revolutionary literature and art aimed at criticizing, exposing and destroying the economic base of the exploiting classes. This form of literature and art which reflects discontent with, exposes and criticizes reality and demands reforms is certainly moving in a direction of clash with the politics of the reactionary classes. At the same time, "that form of literature and art that reflects discontent with the status quo, and the people's interests and aspirations" is in harmony with that kind of politics that is dissatisfied with the status quo, and is in accord with the trend of social development and the political demands of the revolution. Just as Lu Xun said in that same speech: "Politics tends to maintain the status quo in an attempt to turn back the clock, while literature and art play a role in pushing society forward and encouraging it to gradually break with the old order." This is why the progressive and revolutionary form of literature and art has become a thorn in reactionary politicians' flesh and many revolutionary writers and artists not tolerated by politicians have fled their motherland to other countries while others who could not do so have either been banished or even murdered. Under

such circumstances, a clash between the progressive form of literature and art and reactionary politics seems unavoidable or a matter of course, just as it has been the case between the reactionary form of literature and art and revolutionary politics. This clash between work in literary and artistic fields and politics differs in essence with the normal relationship between literature and art on the one hand and politics on the other. Normally, the terms "literature and art and politics" refer to literature and art and politics of the same class. That kind of politics often places specific demands on literature and art, inducing them to suit its needs and to move in the same direction of its development. Of course, it is also possible that sometimes they contradict each other. However, when this occurs, politics always takes timely action to bring literature and art into line again with interests represented by politics and into the orbit set by it. A review of the history of feudal society in China shows that reactionary ruling classes of all dynasties had done everything possible to promote such feudal codes of ethics as loyalty, filial piety, chastity and faithfulness in an attempt to preserve the hereditary feudal order and the political system of the landlord class. Consequently, the society was deluged with poems eulogizing "kindness, decency, and tolerance," prose-style articles full of "flatterers," and plays and novels glorifying the feudal society and disseminating feudal codes of ethics. These literary and art works were soon tossed to the garbage heap by the people and were shortlived because they were produced to serve the political needs of the reactionary ruling classes in betrayal of the people's interests. There were other literary and art works opposed to feudal politics, works written by ordinary laboring people and by some members of the feudal ruling class who cherished progressive democratic ideas. These works are the democratic cream of our cultural heritage. Although they were once suppressed and stifled by the reactionary ruling class, they have been warmly loved and welcomed by the people from generation to generation. In feudal society, there were two categories of literary works—those opposed to feudal politics and those which cherished feudal politics. The fact that we can see only works opposed to feudal order today does not mean that other category of literary works which occupied a dominant position in feudal society did not exist.

As early as 1913, Lenin pointed out: "In every nation and culture, there are nascent democratic and socialist elements. The reason is that every nation has a vast number of laboring and exploited people who live in poverty and who cherish the democratic and socialist ideological systems. Nevertheless, bourgeois culture also exists in every nation along with sinister and church-state cultures which occupy dominant positions in society." ("Critical Views of National Problems") Judging from this statement by Lenin, we cannot apply the fact of rivalry between progressive works in the literary and artistic fields and reactionary politics as a basis for concluding that literature and art are always at odds with politics. In socialist society, the fact that literature and art are in rapport with politics is clearly more visible. The socialist system is brand-new political system in human history, which "is far superior to the social system of the old society." ("On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" by Comrade Mao Zedong) The socialist relations of production are based on the system of public ownership of the means of production. In socialist society where the system of the exploitation of man by man and injustice characterized by oppression of man by man have been eliminated, the working people have become masters of their own country with their interests being represented by the socialist political system.

In the final analysis, under the socialist system, the relationship between work in the literary and artistic fields and politics is essentially one between literature and art on the one hand and the people on the other. Their identity with politics means their identity with the people's interests. Alining literature and art with politics means taking into account the people's interests. Socialist literature and art should graphically reflect the people's life and their needs and interests in various stages of history. In doing so, they should not move in a collision course with politics. On the contrary, they should work in close coordination with politics and enhance politics in a significant way. It can be said that in the old society the more a writer dared to clash with the political system, the more praise his works would receive; the opposite is true in socialist society. In socialist society, the more a writer or an artist dares to clash with the political system, the greater his works will harm the people's interests, thus calling their value into question.

True, the socialist system is relatively new to our country. It is only 30 years old, and therefore needs to be further improved in certain respects. In reflecting the real life in socialist society, writers and artists certainly can touch on the dark side of society and condemn the social ills harmful to the people. This can also be called an "interference" in life and politics. This form of "interference" differs in many ways from "clash," which refers to the clash of fundamental interests. By "interference," we mean exposing, criticizing and eliminating the old in the people's interests and further improving our socialist system rather than jeopardizing the political system and shaking it to its foundation. Graphically speaking, we mean "improving the system" rather than "destroying it." Judging from this fact, the theme of "interference in life" contained in literary and art works is in every sense consistent with the aim of politics and the people's interests, and therefore will in no way clash with politics. Writers and artists will go astray if they are encouraged to estrange from politics.

Will literature and art be in danger of reducing to formulas and talks in abstract terms if they are placed in the orbit of politics? In answering this question, we must draw a distinction between politics and some specific political tasks. By politics, we mean a political system which represents the basic interests of a specific class. Although politics may take various forms, it does not refer to any specific political movement, or political slogans and policies. Nor does it mean any simple accumulation of numerous political tasks and political events. All specific political movements, political slogans and policies must undergo changes made necessary by changes in the domestic and international situation; they must be reviewed and revised as a result of practical implementation. We must also be aware that some policies that are correct at one time and place may turn out to be invalid at another time and place; any mistaken assessment of class forces and inaccurate analysis of the situation can also call certain policies into question. But no such problems exist under the socialist system because everyone in socialist society is committed to constantly perfecting and consolidating such a system. By emphasizing that literature and art should not be separated from politics, we mean that literature and art should be adapted to the needs of the socialist system, or at least the political needs of a specific historical stage. During this new historical period, our task is to adapt them to the needs of the four modernizations. In the past, the narrow-minded and one-sided interpretation of the relationship between work in the literary and artistic fields and politics

and the lopsided emphasis of the metaphysical aspect of literature and art were determined as factors for causing many problems in the literary and artistic fields. Among them were the problems of how to "portray, paint and sing the central issue," and how to simplify literature and art into formulas and stereotyped forms of writing in abstract terms. It is wrong to say that these problems were caused by the insistence on alining literature and art with politics. As a result of interference and sabotage by Lin Biao and the "gang of four," who pushed the line in literature and art to the extreme in order to serve their self-interest, the relationship between work in the literary and artistic fields and politics became more confused than ever in the people's minds. This is a serious lesson we must draw from the modern history of literature. Today, we must correctly understand and handle the relationship between work in the literary and artistic fields and politics when efforts are made to sum up related experiences and draw lessons from such experiences. We can neither attach literature and art to politics nor allow them to become a tool for any specific political movement, or forums for interpreting certain political slogans and specific policies. We should never permit literature and art to estrange from politics and the socialist system, and to move along a course in violation of the people's interests.

II

After concluding a discussion on the relationship of literature and art to politics and their positions in the superstructure, we feel that every writer has his own political views which more or less will affect his work. This is another reason that literature and art cannot be separated from politics.

As we have mentioned earlier, politics not only refers to the political system but also to the political doctrines and viewpoints in the ideological field. This being the case, how can we relate literature and art to politics in the ideological field? Engels once said: "The development of politics, law, philosophy, religions, literature, and art must be based on the development of economics. They can affect each other as well as the economic base." Politics in Engels' terms refers to the political doctrines and political viewpoints in the ideological field. An observation of the roles of literature, art and politics in the ideological field shows that they are independent and mutually related elements capable of influencing each other. "The ideology of the ruling class is a dominant ideology in every era." ("German Ideology" by Marx and Engels) When this ideology spreads to all walks of life in society, it is bound to have direct or indirect, and considerable impact on literature and art. Under the influence of this ideology, writers and artists may produce works which graphically, directly or indirectly, and implicitly or explicitly reflect their political viewpoints, political ideals and political aspiration.

The effect of politics on literature and art is often reflected in a writer's works and his views of the universe. In class society, every writer has his own class status and political views. A specific school of political thought may lead and influence him to offer his views on reality, to express his feeling about life, and to observe and evaluate problems in his own right. It can also affect his decision as to what to write, what to praise and what to repudiate in real drama. In short, every writer's political views and political inclinations are always reflected in his works. For this reason, writers of different political persuasions always have different feelings and views about life, apply different criteria

to evaluate the true, the false, the good, the bad, the beautiful and the ugly, and produce work with different political inclinations. For example, there are two extremely different portrayals of the rickshaw in Lu Xun's novel "A Trivial Thing" and Hu Shi's [5170 6684] poem "A Rickshaw." In other words, extremely different pictures of the same scene are often reflected in works by writers of different political persuasions.

Contradictory world outlooks that exist in a writer can also be vividly reflected in his works. This is another way in which writers' political views can affect their works. There are progressive factors in their world outlooks which lead them to produce advanced works reflecting the true nature of society. There are also backward and reactionary factors in their world outlooks which induce them to present to the public works full of negative and reactionary characters. A typical example is Leo Tolstoy praised by Lenin as "a mirror of the Russian revolution." Contradictions were evident in his political views and political doctrines and were reflected in his works. On the one hand, he bitterly hated Tsarist Russia's tyrannical system, and capitalism characterized by cruelty, and displayed sympathy for the oppressed working people and especially peasants. This progressive way of thinking coupled with outpouring of affection for the oppressed brought him fame as a conscientious realist writer, leading him to present to the world an epic picture of the Russian life and the world's first-rate works exposing the true feature of the reactionary rule. On the other hand, he was a devout Christian, a landlord, and a dawdling and hysteric intellectual in Russia. These backward and reactionary factors in his world outlook sometimes compelled him to depict characters in violation of the principle of realism and to produce works full of characters fanatically promoting the principle of nonviolence as a means to resist evils, and to preach a new religion to lull the masses into sleep. Some people called this "a clash between literature and art on the one hand and politics on the other." On the contrary, we recognize this as a proof that the writers' political beliefs will have profound impact on their works and ways of thinking. It is undeniable that no political tones are present in some literary and artistic works such as watercolors, idyllic poems and songs. Based on this fact, can we say that literature and art have nothing to do with politics, or literature and art can be separated from politics? No. In this connection, we must straighten out the following two points:

First, it is necessary to distinguish literature and art from individual literary and artistic works. Literature and art sometimes can represent a cultural heritage as a whole. One or several literary and artistic works cannot present a panoramic view of literature and art. We must draw a distinction between part and whole and between general and individual works. Individual literary and art works often express their political beliefs either directly or indirectly, either explicitly or implicitly, either blatantly or subtly. Even positive and negative political beliefs can be found in a single literary work. The political tendency of literature and art for a specific period of history cannot be represented by a few individual literary and art works in that specific period. There might be literary and art works whose political tendency is unclear. But this cannot be determined as an indication that literature and art can be estranged from politics. Noting that the history of literature and art as a whole is composed of individual literary and art works, some comrades have asked: Is it fair to say that we cannot use the results from the evaluation of individual literary and art works as a

basis for explaining the general tendency of literature and art? True, the entire history of literature and art is composed of countless literary and art works; the general tendency of literature and art for specific period of history can be noted only through an analysis of many individual works. In other words, the general political tendency of literature and art can be made known only as a result of a survey of hundreds of thousands of literary and art works. This political tendency cannot be represented by a few literary and art works. It is ridiculous to use the results from the survey of a few non-political literary and art works as a basis for concluding that literature and art can be separated from politics?

Second, it is also necessary to conduct a detailed analysis of even such non-political literary and art works as watercolors and idyllic poems. As a matter of fact, in the process of producing these works, their authors are often consciously or unconsciously affected by certain political thoughts. Typical are the tapestry "Great Wall" now hung in the United Nations building, and the Chinese painting "Splendor of Landscape." These art works appear to be non-political because they are appreciated not only by the Chinese and foreigners but also by the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as well. Evidently, their authors were not immune to specific political influence when they produced these masterpieces, a process in which themes and subject matters—a reflection of their love for and pride in the scenic splendors of their motherland were selected. Can anyone deny that this demonstration of love for the motherland and people has nothing to do with the specific political faith? Another example are poems by Tao Yuanming [7118 3220 2494] which reflect his political ideals and his discontent with the dark rule of his time. In short, in class society, no one can transcend politics; literature and art cannot be divorced from politics. Lu Xun said it well: "As far as I know, even those poems by the so-called 'hermit-poets' and 'idyllic poets' in ancient times, could not transcend politics, and the worldly affairs. Even poems dealing with the mundane affairs will remind the people of what has happened in this world." ("Mannerism and Literature of Wei and Jin Dynasties and Relationship Between Drugs and Wine")

Facts show that no writers can produce works without political undertones. Aware of this Lenin once taught the writers that socialist literature must be full of socialist ideas and sympathy for the working people. Our party has also called on our writers and artists to diligently study Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, and to apply the scientific Marxist world outlook to know and dramatize life and to correctly reflect and evaluate reality. Only in this way can they advance along the correct socialist course of literature and art.

Nevertheless, politics cannot be put on a par with literature and art. By demanding that literature and art be not divorced from politics, we do not mean that politics can replace literature and art; nor do we mean that a writer's world outlook can take the place of realism in writing. They are all irreplaceable. Art is something unique in the world. Politics also cannot be separated from literature and art. There are also laws governing their development and growth. Literary and artistic works result from performances of creative mental labor. By way of thinking and by graphic method, a writer can create typical and vivid characters and skillfully depict and dramatize life, giving readers an education and inspiration, inspiring the general public to work for the common good. Such

literary works have nothing in common with instructions on philosophy offered by schools. Life is the source of raw materials for literary and artistic creations; honesty and faithfulness are the life of art. To a writer and artist, life means everything and anything. They must be true to life, and write what they observe, feel and believe in. They must realistically portray life and vividly dramatize characters according to the law governing the development of art. In class society, politics pervades all aspects of life while in socialist society, the proletarian and socialist political beliefs occupy a dominant position. As long as a writer or an artist can realistically portray social life and firmly take hold of the essence and mainstream of life, he will be able to present to the public a correct attitude toward life and politics in his works. This being the case, every writer can skillfully soft-pedal his political views in a natural way through the depiction of various scenes and acts rather than in an unscrupulous and straightforward way. If a writer proceeds from his political beliefs to plot his story in violation of the law governing the development of art and the socialist principle of literature and art, he can never present to the public any truly good works.

III

Viewed from their social functions, literature and art also cannot be separated from politics.

The Marxist theory of literature and art tells us that literature and art originate from life and can play a great role in enriching life in society; in a nutshell, theirs is a role of education, entertainment, enlightenment and appreciation of beauty. Some works present to readers a truthful picture of social life, giving the people an insight into the social activities of all ages and an opportunity to broaden their knowledge about history and life, thus enabling them to increase their ability to know and observe the world. Through the portrayal of characters and events and interpretation of ideas, some works can help the people distinguish truth, goodness and beauty from falsehood, evils and ugliness respectively, form correct political views, foster lofty ideals and broaden the horizon of knowledge through education. There are other works which provide workers and students with entertainments and sensations of enjoyment and inspire them to take a positive attitude toward life and work. This is why literature and art can be called a kind of spiritual food for people, and writers are regarded as engineers of human souls. These roles played by literature and art can be either reflected in a single work or emphasized in different works. Judging from this fact, literature and art can benefit politics or at least do it no harm. In other words, a literary or artistic work must take into account the people's and party's interests which, in our view, constitute politics.

In his report to the Fourth National Cultural Congress, Comrade Zhou Yang [0719 2254] pointed out: "The aim and political task of our literature and art is to foster socialist new personalities, to raise the moral level of the people, to further perfect socialist society and speed up its development, and to satisfy the growing needs of the people's cultural life." This statement reminds the people of the functions of socialist literature and art and the role they should play in the revolution. We oppose any attempt to interpret the social functions of literature and art in a narrow-minded and mechanical way and to turn them into a purely political teaching and monotonous and stereotyped styles of writing, thus leading

the people into a dead alley. We also oppose attempts to steer literature and art away from their intended goals and political aim and to convert them into a profitable business catering to the vulgar interests of the people which bodes ill for society.

For a considerable time to come, the overriding central task facing the people throughout the country is to promote the four modernizations with one mind and one heart; it is also the supreme political task for the present. Comrade Deng Xiaoping said: "Whether or not whatever we do will benefit the goal of the four modernizations should be applied as the most fundamental criterion for evaluating all work and for distinguishing right from wrong." This should also be regarded as the most fundamental criterion for evaluating all literary and art works and for distinguishing right from wrong in this field. We must coordinate literature and art with politics in serving the objective of the four modernizations. Whether a literary and art work is good or bad depends on whether it will enhance or hamper the four modernizations. Instead of shackling the hands and feet of literary and art workers, this demand will stimulate them to take a step forward in emancipating their minds, and in fully and freely pooling their wisdom at the service of the four modernizations. It is gratifying to note that all our writers can now enjoy full freedom in deciding on their themes, in selecting subject matters, in portraying typical characters, and in developing styles of writing for works that benefit the development of the four modernizations. In this connection, the party has unequivocally declared that the question of what to write and how to write should be gradually resolved by the writers themselves through a period of practice and exploration without outside interference. This means that the party now wants to trust writers and artists and pay them due respect and lead them in accordance with the law governing the development of literature and art. The fact that the party wants to trust writers and artists will not result in reducing but increasing their responsibilities, and in placing greater demands on themselves. All conscientious and revolutionary writers and artists must constantly bear in mind their responsibility to society, and must take into account the possible effect of their works on society. They must understand that literary and art works with different political tendencies will have a different effect on society; bad literary and art works will have an adverse effect on society.

During the past few years following the downfall of the "gang of four," many writers and artists have presented to the public a great number of outstanding works which have played a positive role in smashing the mental shackles imposed by Lin Biao and the "gang of four," in eliminating their pernicious influence, in helping the people emancipate their minds, and in inspiring them to march toward the goal of the four modernizations. But it must be pointed out that a few works still merit our attention because of their bad effect on society. Our writers and artists are urged to give due consideration to the overall situation, act in the interests of the people and party, and present to the people the best spiritual food that can help them emancipate their minds, and promote stability and unity of the motherland and the four modernizations program.

SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

KANG SHENG'S ROLE IN DESTRUCTION OF EDUCATION REPORTED

Beijing RENMIN JIAOYU [PEOPLE'S EDUCATION] in Chinese No 9, 20 Sep 80 pp 15-18

[Article by Zhang Xuexin [4545 1331 2450] and Huang Zhanpeng [7806 1455 7720]:
"How Kang Sheng Undermined Our Country's Education"]

[Text] At Beijing University on 25 May 1966 Nie Yuanzi [5119 0337 2737] and others displayed a big character poster which trod on history, confused the enemy with ourselves and sounded the drum for the opening of the "historically unprecedented Great Cultural Revolution." The likes of Lin Biao, "the gang of four" and Kang Sheng called this big character poster "The Twentieth Century Manifesto of the Beijing Commune." Not long thereafter Kang Sheng quite openly said, "I myself wrote the draft for that big character poster." History is fond of toying with such schemers. At that time Kang Sheng very openly and shamelessly bragged about his deeds, but they have not become a confession of how he used the battleground of education to lay down his anti-revolutionary plot.

Since Kang Sheng and the rest used the battleground of education to open their attack on the Chinese people and caused them to suffer such a great calamity, then, in order for us to give a true picture of Kang Sheng, it is helpful to expose the criminal way in which he destroyed our nation's education.

(1)

The big character poster of Nie Yuanzi was an anti-revolutionary conspiracy planned by Kang Sheng, Chen Boda and Jiang Qing. At the end of 1965, after Yao Wenyuan's evil writings PING XINBIAN SHIJU 'HAI RUI BAGUAN' [A NEW CRITIQUE OF THE HISTORICAL DRAMA 'HAI RUI IS DISMISSED FROM OFFICE'] and PING 'SANJILACUN' [A CRITIQUE OF 'THREE FAMILY VILLAGE'] made their appearance, China was then faced with dark storm clouds hovering over the land. On 14 May 1966 the "small theory group" controlled by Chen Boda and Kang Sheng sent some people to Beijing. The pretext was to "carry out an investigation" but the real purpose was to overthrow the party committee and carry out a plot. Kang Sheng incited these people to "start the fires at Beijing University and work on upwards" to "cause a series of disasters." After ten-some days of secret plotting and two revisions of the draft Nie Yuanzi displayed his big character poster on the afternoon of May 25th. On June 1st the Renmin Ribao published this big character poster and with deliberate exaggeration called upon the people to, "decisively, thoroughly, quickly and completely eliminate all ghosts and monsters and all Khrushchev-style anti-revolutionary revisionist elements." Because of this a great disaster then began to descend upon the heads the Chinese people.

If the big character poster of Nie Yuanzi was a "proud creation" planned by Kang Sheng and others in their secret rooms then the speech that Kang Sheng gave at Beijing University two months later was the "shocking undertaking" that shook the foundations. He openly insulted Lu Ping [7120 1627] who was then the president of Beijing University and Secretary of the Party Committee as an "anti-party, anti-socialist scoundrel." Moreover, he took steps to arrange a "struggle against Jian Bozan [5054 0130 6363]," "overthrow bourgeois political power" and later began the so-called "educational reform." The trilogy that Kang Sheng wrote for the cultural revolution consisted of "struggle against evil gains, struggle for political power and undertaking political reform." In an instant the campus of Beijing University was overshadowed by a cloud of fear. Over 260 people were labelled, made to wear dunce hats, paraded through the streets and beaten and sent for supervised labor reform. Over 530 people were illegally stripped of their political rights. They even believed that Beijing University was anti-revolutionary "political showcase" and organized "tours." According to incomplete statistics, in the one month from 29 July to 28 August of 1966, 2.124 million people took this tour. Immediately thereafter the whole nation was engulfed in chaotic criticism, chaotic struggle and chaotic fighting. As soon as any person had been named by Lin Biao, Kang Sheng and Jiang Qing then "no matter who they were, how high their status, or how well qualified" then "they could not escape the flames of the fire." The famous historian Jian Bozan, the party secretary and vice president of Beijing Teachers College Cheng Jinwu [4453 0093 0710], the party secretary of Huadong Teachers College Chang Xiping [1603 3305 5439] and the deputy party secretary of the Zhongnan College of Mining Lin Na [2651 4780] were all named by Kang Sheng, the "gang of four" and the rest and subsequently were hounded to death. After that, Kang Sheng and the rest granted "special privileges" to some of the younger students of Nankai University and five other colleges to carry out a "big roundup" of the so-called "traitors." This one move alone harmed over 5,000 old cadres. The chaos of the cultural revolution continued for the next ten years, but a hint of its basic plan could already be seen in these words and deeds of Kang Sheng. Kang Sheng proved to be a worthy advisor to the theft of party power by Lin Biao and the gang of four. His hands are covered with the blood of the Chinese people!

(2)

Kang Sheng brought harm to the intellectuals by repeatedly saying, "the cultural revolution is a class struggle on the ideological level." (Actually, the harm and repression that Kang Sheng and the rest brought to the intellectuals and other elements of the masses was not limited to the "ideological level" but was an "all-around dictatorship.") With this, he flatly negated Lenin's definition of the division of classes and took over party policy making. In 1950 the Government Administration Council of the Central People's Government clearly ruled that: "the class membership of an intellectual is to be legally determined by his main source of livelihood." Those for whom wages "constitute the total or main source of livelihood are called office workers and office workers are a part of the working class." From the time this policy was issued to just before the cultural revolution our intellectuals followed the socialist path, they made great progress in serving the people and many of them joined the communist party or the youth brigade. Kang Sheng negated all of this with one stroke by irresponsibly saying that the division of classes "must be made according to ideological categories, from the aspect of service to the economic foundation by the superstructure and from political categories." He shamelessly announced that this was a "development" in the theory of

the new age. After that, the "gang of four" and their minions labelled all of our intellectuals as "bourgeois" and lumped them together with landlords, rich peasants, traitors and scoundrels, calling them "nine old stinkers." In this way they exercised "total dictatorship" over the intellectuals. This has both theoretical and historical sources and Kang Sheng is representative of the spread of this reactionary theory.

Kang Sheng has long been an ultra-leftist. In 1958 he said, "it must be clearly understood bourgeois intellectuals are determined by ideology and not by economics," and that "the bourgeoisie and the intellectuals both belong to the exploitive classes." He therefore strongly advocated implementation of high pressure policies against the intellectuals. He said, "they are now not sufficiently pressured," "not sufficiently repressed" and "if they are now surrounded on four sides than they ought to be surrounded on eight sides." All the intellectuals whom he considered to be "no good" were to be "treated coldly to teach them a lesson." During the cultural revolution Kang Sheng played the same old tricks. He joined together with Lin Biao and the "gang of four" and reached unprecedented heights of evil.

Why would this gang of conspirators and ambitious people all become such "cruel persecutors" of the intellectual class? The basic reason is that they wished to sweep away all obstacles to their theft of party power and the spread of their ultra-leftist baggage.

There are two facts which support this:

The first is that in 1958 Kang Sheng, Chen Boda and the rest broadly engaged in extreme leftism but this was reproached and resisted by the broad people including the intellectuals. Kang Sheng thereupon said that they were "white flags" and initiated a movement to "uproot the white flags" among the intellectuals. With great venom in his voice said, "use the principle of the 'three head motions.' Just ask them who told you to nod your head. . . you are bourgeois things and the more you do not nod your head the more that we believe that you are. You have the right to shake your head." "It is our hope that you will bow your head, . . . nodding the head is no excuse, you have the right to shake your head, but bowing the head is what we hope for." This high pressure was to carry out extreme leftism.

The second fact is that on the eve of the cultural revolution, after Yao Wenyuan's PING XINBLAN LISHIJU 'HAI RUI BAGUAN' appeared, all of the famous people in China's historical and literary circles were repressed. At a conference, Professor Jian Bozan said, "in all matters one divides into two so how can a comrade write an article that is completely without error;" the writer Wu Han long ago during the War of Resistance participated in the democratic revolution and in ideological criticism, so to judge a person his individual history must be known;" "if Wu Han is criticized then all progressive intellectuals will become afraid." This move worked against Kang Sheng and Jian Qing and gave them a little trouble in carrying out their political plot. At the beginning of the cultural revolution Kang Sheng announced that Jian Bozan was a "bourgeois 'authority'," and "evil gangster," and a "royalist."

As members of the intellectual class historians advocate accurate writing, writers and artists emphasize being true to life, and news reporters take a mass stance as the "voice of the people." This of course was a thorn in the flesh of those

unprincipled ambitious plotters. They thereupon took advantage of their powers, used high pressure tactics, carried out literary inquisitions, or manufactured false cases in order to obtain their secret goals. In the past and in the present throughout all the world this has always been the case. The likes of Lin Biao, the "gang of four" and Kang Sheng with their vain hopes for feudal fascist dictatorship of all China developed this evil political trickery to a degree which startled people.

(3)

Kang Sheng, who was annointed as an "authority on theory" by Lin Biao and the "gang of four," actually never wrote anything worthwhile. His special skill was to alter the works of Marx-Leninism. At the beginning of the cultural revolution he said to a few of those deceived young people, "its all right to be a little more active and a little more 'leftist'." From the very beginning he used his old familiar trickery to set the keynote: the line in education is a "bourgeois educational line implemented by a reactionary dictatorship." Later, Zhang Chunqiao and Yao Wenyuan developed this theory further and cooked up the reactionary "two estimates." They distorted what Marx said about the unity between education and productive labor, abolished intellectual education, trampled on the rules of pedagogy, destroyed all semblance of order in teaching, and claimed that "it is better to be a worker than to be cultured." All of these are revisions of old tunes that Kang Sheng made in carrying out the extreme left line in education.

Let us take a look at some of Kang Sheng's old tunes.

In 1958 the party central issued a directive regarding educational work. Kang Sheng referred to Marx's work *Das Kapital*, completely distorting what Marx said about child labor and education under the capitalist system and then travelled over the whole country to sell this idea.

Marx wished to protect child workers by "preventing excessive capitalistic exploitation," and "save the next generation by giving them the opportunity to receive a primary school education until their thirteenth birthday and thus wipe out the condition of total ignorance." He loudly called for the passage of laws which would limit the total amount of time a child could work and which would "unite productive labor with intellectual education and physical education," thus developing people with all around training. Marx believed that in terms of complete education for the proletariat it was insufficient to "make primary school education a mandatory prerequisite for physical labor" and that the working class "after winning political power should establish theories and practices that would give industrial arts education its rightful place in the workers' schools." (*Das Kapital*) In 1893 Engels pointed out that among university students there ought to be "produced just such proletariat mental workers" (emphasis added by this writer). The liberation of the working class "requires doctors, engineers, chemists, agronomists and other specialists. This is because the problem is not simply that of controlling the political machinery but is also that of controlling all social production and what is needed for this is not a loud and clear voice but rather abundant knowledge." (A Speech to the International Socialist Congress of University Students) When the revolutionary leaders speak of education their thoughts are always complete and advanced on everything from the limitation of and interference with capitalist exploitation to the great ideal of educating

specialists after the proletariat gains political power. However Kang Sheng paid no attention to time, space or social conditions. He took the idea of student participation in physical labor completely out of context and made it into the only correct policy and meaning of the proletarian reform of education after winning power. On 20 October of 1958 he spoke to the faculty and students of a "Young Pioneer steel plant" in Henan and said, "according to what Marx has said, children can participate in certain physical labor from the age of nine and your work has already proved the truth of this. However, not just nine-year-olds but also seven-year-olds, eight-year-olds and children have the necessary qualities and can be organized for productive labor." He presented the responsible comrade of the Henan Office of Education with a timetable: "the schools are one organizational element of the entire great army of workers," "they can go to class for two hours and work for three hours, work for six hours and go to class for two hours," "those involved in steel work need only work and not go to school." During the First Five Year Plan the state built a number of new middle schools to train the large number of specialists necessary for national construction. Kang Sheng spitefully said, "this is spending money in the wrong place." Such things as physics buildings, chemistry buildings and large libraries "lack a revolutionary atmosphere" and had a "bourgeois appearance." So how are they to be reformed? In one word--labor. Kang Sheng said "its the same way that monkeys became mankind. Monkeys don't know how to work and must learn to do so to become mankind." He ordered the students to get out of the four walls of the classroom. "Go among the fields, to the mountaintops, to the blast furnaces, stop classes and work," "carry dirt, dig mud, build artificial ponds, this is the socialist revolution." He ruled that this was not "rustication, school vacation or voluntary labor," but is a "part of the school plan" and not to do so was to follow the "doctrines" of "bourgeois ideology." He also said that the system of school rules was "chains and fetters" and announced that they were "totally abolished." He claimed that the normal progression of basic education was "doctrinaire," "empty talk," "garbage" and "empty theory" and demanded that students "learn a year's lesson in 15 days," and so on.

During the 1850s Marx was filled with revolutionary enthusiasm and struggled so that child workers whose "bodies were not yet mature and whose limbs were still pliant" might have the right to an education. However, in the fifth and sixth decades of the 20th century the great "authority on theory" Kang Sheng wishes to abolish the schools, replace education with labor, replace teaching with labor and take away the young generation's right to an education. How could there be any similarities between what Kang Sheng has said and the educational ideology of Marx! The "gang of four" became the heirs of Kang Sheng with such nonsense as "digging holes as a profession" and "capturing a capitalist roader is worth a grade of A." Under the pretext of "open-door schooling" they drove the students into society to look everywhere for "capitalist roaders" and capture "traitors." They tied very tight bonds between education and their plot to usurp party power. In searching for the source of all these disasters Kang Sheng is found to be the culprit.

(4)

Education is the foundation for the development of science and the train of human talents. The destruction of education naturally obstructs developments in scientific matters, nonetheless Kang Sheng and the rest directly ran rampant through our scientific efforts.

Marx believed that upon entering the age of the steam engine any person who was still hampered by a "handicraft mentality" was "incredibly stupid." When the whole world has entered the age of high scientific and technological developments the "gang of four" still spout such nonsense as, "the more knowledge the more reactionary" and "it's better to be an uncultured worker." Doesn't this throw our society back into the age of the cave man! Kang Sheng was the first person to advocate such a perverse theory as this.

One of Kang Sheng's "famous sayings" is that "science is a lot of nonsense." As early as 1958 he used the pretext of "eradicating superstition" to trample on and destroy our nation's scientific efforts.

Science is the crystalization of mankind's knowledge and makes progress on the basis of previous discoveries and inventions. Kang Sheng on the contrary labelled science as being "class oriented" and negated objective rules in order to advance metaphysics and the theory of willed determination. He not only announced that psychology was "pseudo-science," and also said that there was nothing at all to agricultural science except veterinary medicine and the prevention and control of pests and plant disease. He wished to expose the "falseness of the old bourgeois agricultural science and permit farming techniques to reach a new stage of development."

He said, "what is called scientific research is nothing but the courage to manipulate some fundamental facts," "all one needs is the courage as there is no mystery to it." When he heard that the milk cows of an agricultural college were producing 2000 kilograms per year he issued a "directive" saying, "milk production is too low so you ought to call the cows together and have a meeting to increase production." He ordered that the colleges not have any direct links with the Academy of Sciences as otherwise "there is the danger of being fettered by rules and regulations." He also wanted the Beijing College of Agriculture to determine a student's standing according to the quantity of production, "per mu production of 1,000 jin for a trainee; 10,000 jin for a research student; 30,000 jin for an expert; and 50,000 jin for a doctorate." He said that this was neither pragmatism nor metaphysics but "dialectics." He also spoke to the faculty and students of a college of engineering saying, "there really is nothing at all to the reactor pile, particle accelerator and rockets so there is nothing at all to be afraid of. Just work at it a bit and successful results will soon follow." Regarding the launching of an artificial satellite, he said, "this is really quite simple, in Shanghai a high altitude cannon was shot off so why can't the schools launch a satellite?"

Kang Sheng had a particular hatred for research work in the science of education and used all possible means to destroy and trample it. In 1956 the party central granted permission for the establishment of a central institute for educational scientific research. Not long after this institute was established Kang Sheng criticized it as "feudalistic, bourgeois and revisionist." He advocated "stressing the present and neglecting the past" saying that all foreign, capitalist and ancient teachings were unnecessary. This actually eliminated all of the institute's scientific research in education. He also found a pretext to criticize it for the "three separations" and sent down and scattered the scientific research personnel so that the institute would be unable to carry out its research work. During the ten years of chaos under the domination of Kang Sheng, Chen Boda and the rest, the educational scientific research institute was finally dismembered, all of the researchers were sent to the countryside to receive "reeducation" and their work came to a halt for many years.

During the time of the cultural revolution there was unity between people such as Kang Sheng who believed in "fearful ignorance" and the theory of willed determination and those people with political ambitions to usurp party power. They brought a disaster of unprecedented proportions to our country's scientific efforts. Of the 58 research labs at Qinghua University, except for slight damage to a few research labs, most of them were heavily damaged and over twenty had to be completely rebuilt. The comprehensive hydrology research lab, one of the most advanced in the world, was completely smashed with heavy hammers. At the Fujian Teachers College over 30,000 ore samples were taken to use as road filler. At Jiangxi University over half of the botanical samples were burned and the samples of fish from Poyang Lake were buried in the ground. This was all said to be, "smashing the 'fortified village' of the bourgeoisie," "destroying the refuge of the bourgeois intellectuals" and "smashing the revisionists' educational line."

It has been five years since Kang Sheng went to his grave wearing the laurels granted him by the "gang of four" but we can lay our final judgement on the lid of his coffin. History is written by the people and the masses have finally exposed the true face of the conspirator Kang Sheng. This is a great historical victory for dialectics! As Marx said, "history itself is a vehicle of judgement and the proletariat is the operator." (ZAI 'RENMINBAO' CHUANGKAN JINANIANHUISHANGDE YANSHUO.) [A SPEECH GIVEN AT THE MEETING COMMEMORATING THE FOUNDING OF THE 'RENMINBAO']

11582
CSO: 4005

SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

PROPER EMPLOYMENT OF TALENTED PEOPLE URGED

10-Point Proposal

Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 15 Oct 80 p 4

[Article by Zheng Yimin [6774 0001 3046] and Chen Gengzheng [7115 2739 6086]:
"A 10-point Proposal for the Mobility of Talented People"]

[Text] Editorial Comment: After having published in this newspaper articles on broadening all avenues for talented people and for mobility of talented people, we have received many articles and letters from our readers, some of them with proposals for broadening the avenues for talented people and for the mobility of talented people. On the question of how to reform our cadre system in order to give full play to the effective employment of talents of all kinds, we would welcome the active expression of opinions from our readers and their suggestions of ways and means.

At present our country has no overall sound system governing the selection, employment, examination, nurturing, rewarding and punishing, the elimination through competition and similar arrangements applying to our cadres, or a generally adopted method of their assignment and appointment. Methods which determined a man's fate for life with one word, or that were too strict, or controls that were too rigid, often created contradictions between the work requirements and a man's specialities or personal preferences, so that many people of special talent were put to work on what they had not learned or were inhibited for long periods of time. This type of cadre system has become increasingly inappropriate for the requirements of the four modernizations, and must be thoroughly changed. Our present policy of liberalization in the economy, we believe, should be paralleled by a similar liberalization of the minds and a liberalized policy when it comes to the development of talents and intelligence. We must render our system more flexible, increase the diversity of our methods and broaden all avenues. Specialists should be allowed to move about within certain spheres to make up the shortages in our system of employment, to bring into full play the special qualifications of talented people, to make the best possible use of a man's talents and make the best possible use of all available talent. We must help supply each other's needs, adjust surpluses and deficiencies and urge the leadership in all departments and all units to make the best use of talented people and also make rational use of talented people.

For this purpose we set forth in the following a few proposals on the question of greater mobility for talented personnel:

1. If specially qualified technical personnel are employed on work for which they are not trained, if they are overqualified for the work they are doing, if they are inhibited and not used it all or have been inhibited for a lengthy period of time and their original unit will not solve their problem, they may select for themselves a suitable work place or unit to work for. As soon as the unit which they want to work for agrees to take them, they may institute procedure for transfer. The original unit shall support their action and must not cause any hindrances, otherwise the person shall have the right to resign.

2. Units engaged in scientific research, industrial enterprises and departments with certain special requirements may, if such actual need arises in their work, publicly advertise and hire specialists. Anyone thus hired shall be released by the unit where he is presently working without any let or hindrance.

3. Engineers, instructors, research assistants and higher qualified persons, also other specially qualified technical personnel of qualifications similar or higher than those mentioned, may accept concurrent employment in other units and enjoy certain additional remuneration for such work, provided they accomplish the work in their original employment.

4. If the requirements of work make it necessary to obtain special technical personnel on loan, two suitable parties may sign a relevant loan agreement. During the specialist's employment on loan, the unit that uses him on loan shall be responsible for his salary, welfare benefits, etc. Loan agreements may be extended on expiry, or, if the work has been completed in advance of time, may be prematurely ended.

5. As science and technology keep advancing constantly, there should be interflow of scientific information on a broad scale between the sciences, mutual coordination of work, and scientists must be allowed to cut across their professional lines, go beyond their departments and even beyond their localities to freely establish links to pursue the major research of our country. As soon as their schemes shall have been checked and approved by the departments in charge of scientific research, all units shall actively create suitable conditions for their support.

6. Those technical specialists who volunteer to work in hardship areas to help develop the border regions, shall, in political respects, receive honorable recognition by the state and in material respects shall receive liberal wages and benefits; their original units shall support their action. On his transfer, the specialist need not change his residential status or food rationing relations, also need not transfer all his family members with him. If he shall request return to his original unit, that unit shall accept him back. If the work in hand requires it, the border areas may offer, engage or negotiate transfers at high salaries in proportion to the qualifications of the man involved and shall not be limited to the present standards of salaries.

7. Technical specialists who are definitely not equal to the task at which they work, may be subjected to reasonable adjustment. In such adjustments the specialist cannot himself find a suitable unit to work for, he shall follow the adjustment

proposed by his organization. If the specialist does not accept the proposed adjustment, the unit may terminate his employment. This way would prove beneficial for employee mobility and for a replacement of the old by the new.

8. All localities and departments must use talents sparingly, draw up appropriate measures for the protection of talents, such as to actively open up sources for talents from among their own localities or departments. Situations where technical specialists are used on work for which they have not been trained, must be adjusted immediately. There should be concern for technical specialists to have them advance politically, to actively create conditions to raise the level of their professional proficiency and to solve the actual difficulties they may experience in their livelihood. Where suitable conditions exist, they may be given "raises in unit rank," bonuses and such other liberal benefits (as soon as the specialist leaves his position, these benefits shall cease).

9. A talent bank shall be established (or a talent exchange center). This talent bank may be set up at the personnel departments. The talent bank shall scientifically "stockpile" various qualified persons by categories and specializations and shall also have to accept applications and recommendations. It shall also advertise employment requests, introduce specialists, etc., so as to link up the various needs in society. Lists, with relevant details on work conditions, concerning technical specialists that are found surplus to requirements or who cannot be easily transferred to some appropriate other position, shall be sent to the talent bank. Cadres that are on such lists shall, during the time that they await reassignment, be carried by their original units on separate records, shall be given appropriate work or shall be trained for higher qualifications; their salary shall be paid as usual and they shall enjoy the usual welfare benefits, but shall not participate in promotions in rank or position, or in assessments for bonus.

10. To give legal protection to all measures that will permit full use of the special qualifications of talented people and to assure rational mobility, a law on personnel matters shall be enacted.

More Proposals

Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 15 Oct 80 p 4

[Article by the Preparatory Team for the Research Association for the Study of Talents: "Proposals for Opening Wide All Avenues for Talents"]

[Text] 1. To establish a committee for the examination of talents. On establishing by examination that a certain person has certain special qualifications or achievements, he shall be issued a certificate and personnel departments shall employ him according to his special skill or knowledge. To establish social testing places, to operate once a year and issue certificates, without regard for age, past schooling, profession, etc., to all university graduates, research assistants, engineers and other persons of similar educational level; they shall be accorded equal treatment and equal professional titles. Testing methods shall be: written examination, oral examination, determined subject and self-chosen subject; examination may be extended over a longer period while candidate is on trial employment.

2. To establish a trial employment contract system for technical specialists of a certain field without a fixed work unit, in order to promote a rational mobility for talented persons. On expiry of the contract period the contract may be renewed or the specialist concerned may be hired by another unit.
3. To establish a talent company. Anyone who has some independent achievements to his credit or has some special skill or knowledge and is employed on work not related to his speciality, may arrange his transfer with the help of the talent company. Any unit may approach the talent company for specialists they need to hire. The talent company shall be a permanent service company to regulate supply and demand of specialists; the company shall accept applications, recommendations and advertise talented persons.
4. To establish a scientific publishing company, partly self-supporting and publicly subsidized. All books, articles and other material published by the company shall enjoy legal protection. Research articles and books not accepted for publication by other publishers may be published by this scientific publication company on a partly self-supporting, partly publicly subsidized basis.
5. To establish a foundation which will grant monetary support to talented people. The foundation may accept contributions from people of all walks of life and shall give monetary support to talented persons who have shown achievements in self-study and who have difficulties in their livelihood, and shall grant supplementary support to talents who are engaged in important creative work. In case supplementary support is needed, the person in need of such may himself submit an application; the foundation will examine the application and on approval will issue the grant. The foundation may also acquire accommodations to establish a "think factory" and make these places available to research personnel for temporary use to complete their creative work.
6. To draw up legal provisions for the formation of a science and technology association. This law shall acknowledge and protect research activities that, through examination, have been found to be definitely of research value and which exceed the scope of research organizations of that branch of industry to which the unit in question belongs. Based on relevant legal provisions, such activities shall be afforded support. In organizational respects, conditions shall be created that will allow those in actual charge of certain research activities of great value to select assistants from either inside or outside their own units.

8453
CSO: 4005

SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

OUTRAGE EXPRESSED AT SEIZURE OF LITERARY MAGAZINE

Beijing WENYI BAO [LITERATURE AND ART JOURNAL] in Chinese No 10, 12 Oct 80 p 44

[Article by Lian Zhengxiang [1670 2973 4382] dated 11 September 1980: "Public Security Cadres Unjustly Seized Literary Publication in Violation of the Law"]

[Text] In the afternoon of 29 June 1980, several people were selling the publication MO SHUI [FOAMY WATERS] on the street in front of the Yudong Restaurant in Leshan, Sichuan Province. They were the editors and amateur writers of that publication, selling it personally once every quarter and also listening attentively to their readers' opinions. The Culture and Education Bureau of Leshan District had started the publication last October, receiving support from writers and relevant departments inside and outside the province. Comrade Ai Wu had written an article in which he welcomed the increase in literary magazines in the province and expressed the hope that this "garden" may bring forth more new literary talent. Comrade Wu Boxiao wrote the calligraphic title on its front page. Comrades Ge Baoquan, Lou Shiyi and others published their poetry and songs in the said publication. Due to the strong native flavor of the publication and its vivid and vigorous style, it was widely well received. Readers vied with one another to buy the publication as soon as a new issue appeared.

At a little after 3 o'clock, a man who said he was from the Public Safety Bureau pushed through the crowd, picked up a copy of MO SHUI and leafed through it, then issued an order: "Stop it, stop it, this cannot be sold anymore!" Sellers and buyers were all flabbergasted. The comrade editor asked the retired workers volunteer liaison man to clarify whether the man was really from the Public Safety Bureau (it was found out that he was the deputy chief of the Leshan City Central District Branch Safety Bureau) and also explained: "Ours is a lawful publication, reported to and approved by the Propaganda Department of the Provincial Party Committee." However, the public safety cadre high-handedly declared: "In Leshan only the HONG LESHAN BAO [RED LESHAN] may be read. Nothing else is permitted." (The HONG LESHAN BAO is a newspaper of the "cultural revolution" era. The new official organ of the Leshan Municipal Party Committee is called LESHAN BAO.) The editor asked the deputy station chief to get the relevant documents from the Culture and Education Bureau, but that man refused to go there. Finally, the editor himself got the relevant documents and asked the man to read them. One document, the reply, reference 1980/66, from the Propaganda Department of the Sichuan Provincial Party Committee to the Propaganda Department of Leshan District, reads as follows:

"We agree to the continued publication of your Culture and Education Bureau of the literary publication of general nature called MD SHUI. The publication is to be a quarterly one, of sixteenmo format, 80 pages per issue and 10,000 copies per issue, to be distributed in principle within its local area. Supply of the required paper is to be applied for from the Provincial Bureau for Light Industry."

To everybody's surprise, the said deputy station chief refused to look at the document. He was shamed into anger and reprimandingly said: "Don't you raise an emperor to crush the feudal lords." The editor questioned him whom he meant with "emperor" and "feudal lords." The deputy chief found himself unable to answer and merely came up with something like: "You use the local revolutionary committee to oppose the municipal safety bureau!" The editor felt it not the right thing to go on quarreling publicly on the street and suggested that both parties calmly call on the municipal party committee for guidance and to negotiate a solution. But the deputy chief peremptorily insisted: "I am after all representing the Public Safety Bureau; sales of the books must definitely be stopped!" He then ordered a people's policeman to forcibly remove 191 copies of the MD SHUI and 28 copies of the XING XING [STARS] poetry publication. The masses that looked on asked the editor worriedly: "Are you in trouble with your publications?"

The editorial comrades of the MD SHUI were utterly outraged. The same evening they made representations to the secretary of the municipal party committee. Up to today the deputy chief has not yet admitted his error and returned the publications, so that the problem has not yet found its solution.

8453

CSO: 4005

SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

RELAXATION OF CONTROL OVER LITERATURE, ART URGED

Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 8 Oct 80 p 5

[Article by He Junying [0149 0193 5391], head of Propaganda Department, Lai'an County Party Committee, Anhui Province: "Give Free Reins to Reform; Don't Control With a Stranglehold"]

[Text] In improving our guidance or reforms in literature and art, the primary condition is to guide and lead in an emancipation of the mind, to give free rein and courageously support the cultural departments in breaking down the old restrictions and then actively reform.

Our county has a theatrical company, a unit of collective ownership. In the past, in addition to a certain subsidy from the state, it mainly relied on income from its performances. Economically it could not be self-supporting and was regarded as a "burden." The average pay to the performers was in general very low. They had no place to train and also very poor living conditions. The pay was furthermore almost the same for main actors and the others in the general cast, and it mattered little who worked more and who did less. For a long time the enthusiasm of the actors and employees could not be developed. What could be done to make a success of operating this theatrical company at the county level? At one time we placed our hopes on converting the system of collective ownership into one of ownership by the entire people. Last year, under the influence of trials in the nationwide reform of economic management systems and the systems of production responsibility in agriculture, we began to realize that in the literary and art teams we also had need to step up the emancipation of minds. In the winter season of last year, we decided to support them on a trial basis when the theatrical group proposed to work in teams and to introduce a system of bonuses. The theatrical group of over 70 members was divided into two teams, and the income of performances was divided up between the group and the teams according to a fixed scale. Within the team the income was divided, and apart from subtracting the performance expenses, the balance was for bonuses to actors and employees and for a reserve fund for the team. In the course of trying out this system, we helped them summarize experiences and to decide on an even more rational ratio of distribution so as to better deal with the related interests of the three parties concerned: the group, the teams and the performers. At the same time we asked the theatrical group to reform their economic administration and at the same time strengthen work in political ideology and professional training so as to raise the quality of their performances. Judging from the practical results during the first half

of this year, very conspicuous effects have been achieved by the reform of the administrative system. Due to performances being staged by the teams, there was competition between them. The teams had freedom to choose their own repertoire and also as to what line they wanted to pursue in their performances. The material interests of the individual actors and employees and the economic interests of the team were directly linked, which greatly stirred their enthusiasm and everyone's concern for a higher quality of the performances and for economy in expenditure.

As to setting up programs for performances, it is even less advisable to use administrative measures in guiding such work. Control to the extent of strangulation and overmuch interference are both erroneous methods. In the last 3 years, we have changed our past methods of having the scripts determined by a limited number of leadership people in the relevant department of the provincial party committee and have adopted a method of having leadership, authors and the masses in a triple cooperation jointly adjudge the scripts. In 1978, our county organized the joint writing of 14 short plays by amateur writers and professional writers. After the initial draft was completed, the amateur writers and the professional writers were organized to take over a month's time for a thorough, bit by bit evaluation and revision of the 14 scripts. The amateur writer Wang Ganchen wrote a short play reflecting the trend of reforming management on the trade front. The title of the play was "Effective Reform." During the discussion, a number of comrades felt that this script was interesting, but there were also some comrades who felt that the play, being a play of exposures, should not be performed. We led everybody in a discussion of this question and finally everybody agreed that literary and art works should actively expose the contradictions in life. It was thought that this short play, "Effective Reform," in its criticism of the erroneous experiences of the purchasing agent for live pigs and in describing the man's reform, was written in a vivid and vigorous manner, very apt to bring enlightenment to others. To improve the script even further, we mobilized the theatrical group's producers and performers to take part in the editing, and thus achieved an even better result on the stage. When participating in a stagecraft meet for the Chuzhou area, our group won second prize for new creations. As to the adjusted versions of traditional stage plays, there was controversy among the masses. Apart from listening to the various opinions of the masses, we held a symposium at the theatrical group to evaluate the scripts together with the comrades of the theatrical group and told them our viewpoint as to obviously uncouth sections and irrational plots. As regards artistically somewhat uncouth sections in the scripts and certain shortcomings in the plots, we did not insist on perfection, but rather allowed the theatrical group to effect themselves revisions and improvements.

8453

CSO: 4005

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

~~7~~ 79 Jan 1981

DD.